DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 261 IR 004 038

TITLE	National Perspectives for ARL Libraries. Minutes of the Semi-Annual Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (86th, Houston, Texas, May 8-9, 1975).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISSN-0044-9652
PUB DATE	May 75
NOTE	139p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Communication (Thought Transfer); Conference Reports; Costs; *Information Dissemination; Information Services; Interlibrary Loans; Library Networks; Library Role; *National Programs; Periodicals; *Publishing Industry; Research; *Research Libraries; Scholarly Journals
IDENTIFIERS	ARL; *Association of Research Libraries; National Commission Libraries Information Science

ABSTRACT

The focus of this Association of Research Libraries meeting was the process of scholarly communication--its costs, complexity and justification. Three speakers made first day presentations. Edward Booher reported on a study of the production and dissemination of scholarly work. He advocated the collaborative efforts of libraries and publishers. Fritz Machlup reviewed his findings on the costs of knowledge production in the United States. He proposed more precise studies of library holdings and publisher production by subject field in order to better allocate production resources. Discussion and the business meeting followed. The second day's program included a lengthy discussion of the national program statement of the National Commission on Library and Information Science. Two speakers, Basil Stuart-Stubbs and Vernon Palmour then made presentations on the need to improve interlibrary loan procedures with a national periodicals lending bank and a network for access to texts, tapes, graphics and other library materials. Appendixes to the minutes include a membership roster and reports from the Committee on University Library Standards and other ARL divisions. (KB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129261

US ISSN 0044-9652

National Perspectives for ARL Libraries

Minutes of the Eighty-Sixth Meeting

May 8-9, 1975
Houston, Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR004038

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CONTENTS

Page

Opening..... 1

SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION: NEW EFFORTS TO UNDERSTAND A COMPLEX PROCESS

Introductions
Richard De Gennaro..... 2
Warren Haas..... 2

The ACLS National Enquiry
Edward Booher..... 5

The Production and Distribution of Scientific and Technical Information
Fritz Machlup..... 18

Discussion..... 28

BUSINESS MEETING

Commission on Access to Resources..... 36
Commission on Management of Research Libraries..... 37
ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards..... 39
Committee on Access to Manuscripts & Rare Books..... 44
National Program for Acquisitions & Cataloging Liaison Committee..... 47
Task Force on a National Periodical Resources Plan..... 47
NCLIS National Program Document..... 49
Criteria for Membership in ARL..... 49
ARL Membership in the Center for Research Libraries..... 50
Report of the Executive Director..... 51
Report of the President..... 57

A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES
Alphonse Trezza..... 59

Reactors:
Ralph Hopp..... 66
William Dix..... 68

Discussion..... 72

SHARING RESOURCES: NATIONAL CENTERS AND SYSTEMS

Introduction
Richard De Gennaro..... 78

Speakers:
Basil Stuart-Stubbs..... 78
Vernon Palmour..... 84
Arthur Hamlin..... 90

Discussion..... 91

APPENDICES

		Page
A.	Report of the Commission on Access to Resources	94
B.	Report of the ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards	95
C.	Report of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee	114
D.	Report of the Task Force on a National Periodical Resources Plan	117
E.	Getting to Know the ARL	119
F.	Attendance at 86th Meeting	121
G	Officers, Board of Directors, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces of the ARL	125
H.	Membership of the ARL	130

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 86th Meeting

Richard De Gennaro, presiding

The Eighty-sixth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Hyatt Regency Houston Hotel in Houston, Texas on May 8 and 9, 1975.

President Richard De Gennaro opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

Mr. De Gennaro then discussed the theme of the program: "National Perspectives for ARL Libraries."

SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION: NEW EFFORTS TO UNDERSTAND A COMPLEX PROCESS

Introduction

MR. DE GENNARO: The theme of the program is "National Perspectives for ARL Libraries." This morning's program will be devoted to the broad problems of the relationship between scholars, publishers, indexing and abstracting services, research librarians, and to the changing environment in which these groups will operate in the coming years. I will now turn to Warren Haas, who will be the moderator for this morning session.

* * * *

MR. HAAS: The subject of this morning's presentation is scholarly communication -- a process involving scholars, publishers, abstracting and indexing services, and research libraries. The process is affected by technology, economics, fashion and fads, and, hopefully, by the goals and objectives of scholarship and research.

Our speakers will describe both on-going and proposed studies that are intended to improve our understanding of this complex subject and to suggest ways to make the system work better than it now does. But before turning the program over to them and later on to you for your questions and comments, I want to follow the instructions given me and consider briefly the pertinence of the subject and the kinds of influence and leadership research libraries might exert during this period of what promises to be dramatic change in the technological methods and organizational strategies employed in the scholarly communication process.

The subject of information distribution and scholarly communication is receiving a great deal of attention. For example, the Office of Science Information Service of NSF has dedicated a significant portion of its limited research support funds to an Economics of Information program designed to generate data "on the costs, benefits, supply and demand relationships, and ways of achieving economic viability of scientific information services." In another context, the subject of scholarly communication is implicitly woven into the discussions related to the revision of the copyright act. Foundations and endowments which fund research but not publication of the results, acknowledge the subject as a problem area, university presses conduct internal studies to explain declining sales, learned societies are beginning to express concern about the future of scholarly publishing, and individual scholars lament their inability to buy for their personal libraries the most important new books in their field.

The reasons underlying these concerns are in large part obvious:

1. Both the prospect of profit and the present high cost of producing and distributing books and journals have affected all segments of the information chain. The structure of the publishing world has been altered, publishing objectives have in some cases been recast, and the acquisitions programs of libraries have often been distorted. As a result, every component of the system has begun to search for technical and organizational innovations designed to overcome present difficulties.

2. The scholarly communication process is becoming increasingly complex. The simple author-publisher-bookseller-reader relationship of the past has been transformed by the growth of specialty journals, abstracting and indexing publications, computer-based search services, cooperative acquisitions and remote storage facilities superimposed on local library operations, and access and delivery systems that span states, the nation and even the Atlantic. This transformation has generated new costs, new expectations, and new frustrations.

3. It is perhaps this complexity coupled with high costs that is apparently forcing a small number of leading scholars in certain subject fields to establish alternative closed systems for communication of their most advanced work to a very limited number of favored colleagues working with them on research frontiers. There is some evidence that these people, who constitute the academic leadership of the nation, have at least in part given up on traditional methods. There are indications that material of great importance never gets formally published and made generally available. It seems that the system has been overwhelmed, and there is a growing danger that trivia is driving out material of permanent value.

4. Finally, the worldwide audience for the products of scholarship and research is expanding, and there is a growing pressure for more equitable access to information. However, the sheer number of users and the great quantity of recorded information, perhaps coupled with an increase in the number of hyphenated subject fields, have made for even more unpredictability of user needs.

These problems -- economic difficulties, system complexities, system failures, and expanding demands -- are neither trivial nor temporary. It seems certain that remedial action, to be effective, must substantially affect every component of the system and the habits and outlooks of scholars, publishers, and librarians.

Think back to last May, when ARL met in Toronto. On the program was a review of the findings of work done by William Baumol and Mattityahu Marcus on the Economics of Research Libraries. The conclusion then was that the cost trends of the past cannot realistically be projected into the future. The message was that dramatic change is required in the near future in the ways of research libraries, and the question was whether research libraries will guide the change or whether they will simply accept a future plotted by others -- perhaps others with less noble objectives than those professed by

all of us.

It is a year later; that question is still with us, and there is a year less time in which we can act.

As librarians, we have to find a way to contribute substantially to the shape of the scholarly communication process. We can do so:

- by focusing on our fundamental and continuing objectives, not on our past methods.
- by sharpening our critical sense, for we have a quality-control obligation in this process; one we have not always acknowledged or upheld.
- by viewing library functions in the context of a larger set of social objectives, not simply as an isolated and detached segment of the scholarly communication process.
- by facing up to the fact of a technology that will, one way or another, substantially alter our services and our methods.

The magnitude of the job facing all of us committed to stimulating creative intellectual activity and to putting the record of human achievement and discovery to work is incredibly large. We talk about what should be done, but we find taking the necessary first steps most difficult. I do not pretend to know how to proceed, but the two speakers we have with us demonstrate that we are not alone in our search for solutions. As they describe their efforts, let us look for ways to join forces -- we all need all the help we can get.

* * * *

THE ACLS NATIONAL ENQUIRY

Edward E. Booher
McGraw-Hill Book Company

MR. HAAS: I would like now to introduce our first speaker, Edward E. Booher. He has been a member of the Task Force at the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) that has for almost a year labored to produce a proposal that is now being assessed by a combination of foundations and the National Endowment for the Humanities. The proposal is entitled "A National Enquiry Into the Production and Dissemination of Scholarly Knowledge."

Mr. Booher is President of the Books and Education Services Group of McGraw-Hill. He has been a director of that corporation since 1961, and, Director of McGraw-Hill Book Company since 1951. In June of 1967, he was elected Chairman of the newly-created Board of Higher Education of New Jersey, a post he held until three years ago. He continues to serve as a member of that Board. Prior to that time, Mr. Booher served as Chairman of Governor Hughes' Conference on Education, the recommendations of which led to a separation of higher education from secondary and elementary education in New Jersey.

Mr. Booher was born in Dayton, Ohio in 1911, graduated from Antioch College in Yellow Springs, and was a trustee of Antioch for some time. He was President of the New York Academy of Public Education in the latter 50's; President of the American Textbook Publishers Institute, and until June 1974 served as Director of the Association of American Publishers. He is on the Advisory Board of the Partisan Review as Chairman of the International Group of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM).

He is a member of the Visiting Committee of the Harvard School of Education, a trustee of the Yale University Press, and a member of the United States Joint Commission for Education and Culture. This is obviously a man who is as knowledgeable as one can be in publishing and one who, at the same time, has seen the publishing process as a part of a wide-ranging set of social obligations.

He has been an incredibly effective contributor to the ACLS, and it is anticipated that he will be the principal advisor of the "National Enquiry," on the assumption that the funding that will make it possible will be forthcoming shortly.

* * * *

MR. BOOHER: If there is to be a National Enquiry into the production and dissemination of scholarly knowledge, and if I am to be the director of that study, then I feel that it would be appropriate for me at this point to give you some indication of where I stand, how I regard libraries and librarians, since research libraries are such an important component of the study -- potentially the principal benefactors from it.

I am just now entering my fortieth year of book publishing -- all with McGraw-Hill, and these years were preceded by two years of bookselling. So I am a book man who has been exposed, at least, to all facets of publishing all kinds of books, both here and abroad. I hasten to add, however, that the last five years of my life seem to have been spent solving problems and reading financial statements! Further, I should tell you that I was reared in my trade by a person most of you know by name at least, for he has written and spoken so much on copyright and related matters. I refer to Curtis G. Benjamin, one of the real hard-liners on the subject. But I would also assure you that at the age of 64, I am my own man.

Currently, I am privileged to serve as Chairman of the International Group of Scientific, Technical, and Medical Publishers. This organization, an affiliate of the International Publishers Association, represents something over 100 journal and book publishers throughout the world, including a number of nonprofit enterprises such as the American Institute of Physics. Last October in Frankfurt at the annual General Assembly of STM I made some remarks that I would like to repeat here, principally because I think they represent my general position on a number of questions that could relate to my directing the study which I will shortly discuss. And I refer to these STM remarks because I think they speak to that issue. The audience I addressed in Frankfort was a small one of about 150 people. It was largely nonAmerican. I suppose there were a dozen or 15 American publishers in the audience, but it was made up primarily of German, Dutch, and British journal and book publishers with a sprinkling of French and Italian and Czechs, a Russian or two, some Japanese and so on. If you think that American book publishers have a "thing" about copyrights, you ought to talk to some of the German and Dutch; they are absolutely paranoid on the subject.

I hope you will take these comments in the context of that particular audience, because these are very generalistic comments, simplistic, as a matter of fact. What I was trying to do was to get across, if I could, the need for a change in attitudes, and I felt, and I still feel, that it is very much needed. These are excerpts from the speech I made there.

> The library community is perhaps our biggest customer, and it is increasingly important to entertain good relations. If we only look at the things that divide us and entrench ourselves in fixed positions, we will get nowhere. Instead of fighting the library world because we think they wish to buy fewer books and journals and make and exchange more photocopies, we should join them in their fight for more funds to buy more books and journals and to pay us and our authors for more photocopies! If we have in many instances been fighting windmills, so have the libraries. What we should do is band together, forget about fighting, and look at what unites us.

This is why we scientific publishers should help and support and promote

-- all efforts to bring about more universal bibliographic access and control;

-- all efforts to educate and train people in the information profession -- including its technology;

-- all efforts to link the national and international private and public information resources, systems and technologies;

-- and all efforts to bring about mentality changes in parliaments and other legislative powers, impressing on them the need for sufficient funds to enable the scientific and technical libraries to function properly.

Nor should we oppose photocopying as such, since it certainly has untold useful library applications. Collective and cooperative interlibrary networks are also in our interests, provided such networks are financially viable and provided real costs are not at the expense of the information suppliers, that is authors and publishers.

Most of all, however, I should like to plead in favor of what the social scientists call the harmony model rather than the conflict model. Now that it seems fairly certain that the programs of UNISIST -- originally a purely scientific initiative -- and NATIS -- a recent library/documentation/archives project -- are going to merge or at least join forces, we may expect that the library community will become more influential internationally, especially in UNISIST -- with which we are mainly concerned. It is only natural, therefore, that we must initiate somewhat closer ties with the international library and documentation organizations. As regards the new concept of Universal Bibliographic Control, we believe that a major step has been made by the introduction of CIP - Cataloging-in-Publication, which is fast becoming, or has already become, normal practice in countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Brazil. This is a case in point where publishers are actually working together for the benefit of the library world.

The ultimate objective of publisher-library collaboration, after the problems of bibliographic control, of the enlightenment of national and international legislators, and of the education and training of professionals is, of course, obtaining harmony in copyright matters. We all know what

'fair use' or fair dealing' means, but I very much doubt that even in this audience there could be complete agreement on it. Of course, on both sides there are still diehards, but if one compares the views on copyright in the original 1971 UNISIST report, which spoke of legal barriers to the free flow of information, and of monopolies, with the language in the main working document for the NATIS Conference (1974), stating that in all countries legislation should exist protecting intellectual property and recognizing 'the obligation to use the vastly improved reprographic technology in ways that will not threaten the validity of the publication processes,' if one compares these two, it is not difficult to see that there has been considerable improvement.

And also on the national level there are notable rays of hope: in my country, the United States, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science works on the assumption that the rights of authors and publishers can be incorporated in ways that maintain their economic and competitive viability. In the Netherlands where a recent survey has shown that an estimated four billion pages were reproduced in 1972 by various reprographic methods, of which 137.5 million were protected by copyright, recent legislation has fixed a copying charge per page copied, for copies made by public authorities, educational establishments, and libraries, while industry and commerce have to pay what is called an equitable remuneration, to be fixed by negotiations. These appear to be major steps -- and I could mention a number of others as well -- towards the recognition, in practice, of what always has been recognized in theory, and which Barbara Ringer has expressed so well, and here I quote Miss Ringer:

> The purpose of copyright law is not to strike an economic balance between consumers and the owners of a species of monopoly rights. Instead, its purpose should be to recognize independent authorship as infinitely precious and to do everything possible to encourage and reward it.

We should therefore do everything in our power to collaborate with the national and international library communities; after all, we have the same public to serve -- a public which contain both our authors and their readers.

Now if I may, I should like to turn to the proposed study. There is no better way to advise you of its scope and purpose, as well as of the results expected, than by citing parts of the proposal for funds addressed to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and three private foundations,

who are being asked to match funds appropriated by the NEH. This proposal, by the way, is the product of a committee effort -- and I suppose it shows it. The drafting committee, however, comprised of Herbert Bailey, David Breneman, Warren J. Haas, Chester Kerr, Robert Lumiansky, Thomas Noble, George Winchester Stone, and me, depended on Mr. Noble of the ACLS to put the paper into final form. Thanks to Mr. Noble's facile pen and patience and judgment, I feel that the final document came out much better than the Committee had a right to expect.

From this point forward, I shall be reading from the proposal that went to the NEH on April 17. We should have word of its acceptance or rejection during the next fortnight.

> The need for such an enquiry as the one herein proposed is prompted by the conviction that contemporary social, technological, and economic circumstances require a thoroughgoing study of the generation and dissemination of American scholarly knowledge, by which we mean not simply the results of specialized research but of serious enquiry in any field, wherever conducted. We are chiefly concerned here with print and such related media as microform publication of all sorts. In short, by "scholarly knowledge" we mean serious ideas based on careful thought and conveyed by the written word. For convenience, we speak of "scholars," without intending to confine our meaning to those working in universities.
>
> The importance to society of fostering the best intellectual efforts of scholars and of receiving the best products of serious thought as efficiently as possible is assumed: we believe, with the founders of our Republic, that the strength and workability of any democracy depends upon the education of the voters. The urgency of initiating in the immediate future a national enquiry into our system of the communication of knowledge may be deduced from the problems besetting scholars, publishers, and librarians, and -- less dramatically apparent but equally important -- from the sense that the general public does not benefit as it should from the work of serious thinkers.
>
> Our goal is effective scholarly communication, and as a starting point it will be necessary to learn what those words really mean. It will be important to learn about the needs of scholars as scholars themselves perceive them, not just as they are seen by librarians, publishers, technologists, and economists. The process of scholarly communication is of first importance because it is fundamental to the purpose of scholarship itself. Effective dissemination of the work of scholars provides the means for testing the quality of scholarship by the specialist's colleagues and by the general public.
>
> At the beginning of our century the scholar in any field read, hypothesized, developed his thought and documented his con-

clusions from the storehouse of the library or the experimentation of the laboratory; he then wrote, had his writing judged, and, finally, published. The results pushed back the barriers of ignorance, advanced knowledge, and lay ready for succeeding generations to use for a continuing advancement. In the 1970s, however, problems of bigness, problems of speed, and problems of cost have taxed and almost overcome us in organizing and disseminating useful knowledge. A complex series of developments has now produced not a system but a nonsystem of discovery, production, and dissemination of the knowledge which the world needs.

Different rates of development have taken place in what should be parts of a meaningful system, and some developments have at times been at cross-purposes with habits of research and expectations of significant communication, both to specialists and to wider circles of intelligent men and women. To take one specific example, hopes for advancement for graduate students and young scholars have been tied to rapid publication. The economic pressures resulting from this course have diluted the quality of much published research. Specialized "scholarly" journals have proliferated beyond anyone's ability to read and absorb all. Publishers continue to publish books at the rate of 40,000 annually in the United States alone. What fraction are reviewed? What readership can be counted on? What impact does the increasingly expensive effort have? The excellent specialized books, because of a small market, are losing propositions for publishers, who cry for subvention in order to produce them at a price within the means of those who need them. Libraries, the great preservers of knowledge, are foundered by sheer bulk and the rapid rise in cost. Standards for recording data, for computer software, or even for the format of microtexts have not been devised, and unless the interfaces of the various "systems" are recognized, organized, and acted upon a new Babel will soon be upon us. Each new field of knowledge seems to breed its own new areas of ignorance.

To take another example, a recent review by a member of the drafting committee of this proposal of applications for federal support for 26 specialized bibliographies in the humanities provides a thought-provoking demonstration of inefficiency and wastefulness in the production of basic research tools. Requests ranged from $8,000 to $300,000, and the total for the 26 came to $1,600,000. If each bibliography had been discrete, basic, and planned for constant up-dating and ready retrieval of combinations of the information stored therein -- a system which modern technology can in fact provide -- federal expenditure might

be justified. Analysis of the 26, however, indicated great overlap, excessive start-up costs, and methodologies ranging from acquisition of information, hand-written on 3x5 cards to the most sophisticated designs for computer tape recording, along with incompatible systems, language, programming, and a diversity of machines. There is every reason to suppose that the same agency will continue to receive such proposals at a similar rate. The study proposed here can provide valuable guidelines for policy decisions in these circumstances, and in time will lead to greater efficiency in the conception and design of bibliographical systems.

Our first problem is that we neither understand our present system nor use it efficiently. Moreover, we do not even understand the extent to which it is not a system. Parts of it have been analyzed. For a dozen years the Office of Science Information Service (OSIS) of the National Science Foundation has studied, reported, and effected important changes in the system of communication for science. Librarians have conducted their own studies, as have scholarly societies. Publishers have done less, partly owing to the fragmented nature of publishing as an industry, and partly because private industry cannot legally do some of the things being proposed in this study. No agency has previously tried to comprehend our differing and often clashing systems for the communication of scholarly knowledge from an overall point of view with the purpose of recommending and effecting beneficial change. The present proposal approaches the spreading chaos in the dissemination of serious thought by recognizing the need for a "systems attack," and by addressing the problems in a novel way, namely by the collaboration of six estates which hitherto have gone their own ways separately--scholars, publishers, journal editors, librarians, foundations, and technologists.

Secondly, we are faced with a deteriorating situation. The present process appears to be moving toward a general crisis. Scholarly journals have proliferated, partly because new fields have been identified as knowledge itself has expanded and fragmented into many specialties. Journals are in financial trouble, as are libraries, their chief subscribers. As libraries are forced to cut back on subscriptions and journals have to raise their rates, the dissemination of knowledge suffers. Much the same can be said of books, as evidenced by the well-known difficulties of university presses and the problems of commercial publishers, who increasingly shy away from the publication of advanced monographic studies.

It is important to note, however, that while the many activities involved in the production and dissemination of scholarly knowledge require economic analysis, our concern is not exclusively or narrowly economic. We need to understand better the effects of changing procedures and technology not on financial ledgers alone but on the process of discovery and creation. This is to say that while the problem shows itself first as economic, a better understanding of the system will enable participants (scholars, publishers, librarians, readers) to effect changes that will sustain and improve communication itself.

The processes involved in the production and dissemination of scholarly knowledge have tended in recent years to grow more numerous, increasingly complex, and more and more expensive. It is more than possible that because of this growing complexity our present methods for publishing, distributing, abstracting, indexing, storing and preserving information are at least in part outmoded and perhaps self-defeating. It is essential in this investigation that these activities be seen as means to an end and be considered subject to adjustment, including refinement and perhaps even substantial modification of the "boundaries" between the several parts of the present mechanisms. In short, we need to consider whether:

1) new kinds of coordination are possible between research libraries and at least some aspects of publishing. Changes made at the junction of these two enterprises might open new prospects for publishing and serve library obligations, all the while better meeting the needs of scholars.

2) whether new and perhaps dramatically different methods of describing, analyzing, and locating recorded information might result in a remarkable increase in the use of recorded information.

3) learned societies and professional organizations have a more important role to play in determining the quality of what is published.

4) the trend toward life-long education will create new demands for the products of scholarship, perhaps produced in new ways and

even recast as specialized teaching materials for whole new categories of interested and able users.

5) communications and computer technology will open completely new approaches to the process of scholarly communication in at least some fields rather than simply modifying existing systems.

Now a word about the scope of the Enquiry and areas for investigation. Full exploration of the many and complex problems of producing and disseminating the results of scholarship in the decades immediately ahead will require a period of four or five years. The effects of the on-going enquiry, however, will be evolutionary and cumulative. Thus, early surveys and reports will provide the foundation for later phases of investigation. Each individual report, of value in itself, will also contribute to our knowledge and decision-making with regard to the whole system.

In many sessions of wide-ranging discussion, the drafters of this proposal outlined in some detail all aspects of the system of scholarly communication which they felt needed investigation. They concluded that almost all significant problems are comprehended by the ten headings listed below. While these topics relate to and often overlap each other, it is assumed that the directors of the Enquiry will devise an approach to any single topic that will relate the study of it to the purpose of the whole Enquiry. The topics are listed not in order of "crisis priority" but, in general, in a linear progression from author to reader:

1) Problems of Scholarly Motivation

2) Quality Control in Research

3) Quality Control in Published Research

4) Selection, Dissemination and Use of Scholarly Works

5) Economic Difficulties of Publishing Specialized Books and Journals

6) The Role of Subvention

7) The Proliferation of Scholarly Journals

8) Technological Options in Production and in Bibliographical Access

9) Preservation and Access

10) Bibliographical Structures

11) Extending the Audience

The first phase of this study (and that is the part that we are immediately concerned with) should be apparent at this point. Scholarly communication is an enormous topic, with many interrelations among its parts, and we think the proposed comprehensive examination should be undertaken with the intention of carrying it through to the end. We propose starting with two manageable projects to get a better understanding of the problem as a whole, to see what can be accomplished, and to allow for a reassessment of directions and budgeting at an interim stage. The two topics, to be completed in about twenty-four months, are sufficiently related to feed into each other, yet separate enough to expose a variety of aspects of the total picture. The topics are:

Study #1. Quality Standards and Economic Factors in Book Publication: Myths, Money, and Monographs

Study #2. The Functioning of Scholarly Journals in the Knowledge System: Experience and Alternatives

Study #1 will deal primarily with academic books, but will also include significant books that interpret academic findings to a broader public. It will attempt to assess the "publish or perish" problem in relation to the future demand for faculty and the availability of promotions. It will look at trends of costs and prices of books in relation to their distribution, particularly library distribution, and their actual use, especially in libraries. In addition, the study will draw on technical research being carried on by private and public institutes and manufacturers relating to reproducing, storing, and retrieving information, both mechanically and electronically.

Study #2 will draw heavily on studies already done by OSIS and several scholarly and scientific societies, but additional information (especially future projections) will have to be collected. The results will be examined in the

light of alternative systems and the problem of bibliographic access. In the latter area the chemists, physicists, and biologists have gone much further than the humanists and social scientists, but it is not obvious that their experience is directly applicable to other fields. It will be important to examine the applicability of such techniques as interest profile distribution, key word indexing, citation indexes, abstracting, microform publication, etc. in areas outside the sciences. Other matters under study will include methods of selection of publication, rates of rejection, and postpublication use and evaluation.

Now, what are some hoped for accomplishments of this next 24 months of work? As a general hypothesis, it seems reasonable to suppose that the two studies will show that the problems in the publication, purchase, and use of scholarly journals and serious books on important subjects result from a complex matrix of interrelated factors or pressures, among the most important of which are:

1) The proliferation of scholarly journals and the preference which libraries with limited funds give journals over books.

2) Pressures on young scholars to publish even trivial or duplicative materials and to create new journals to find outlets for their work.

3) The absence of up-to-date knowledge on scholarly needs for journals, books, and bibliographic data.

4) The cost limitations imposed by present publishing technology, both in manufacturing and distributing.

5) The confusion which exists about the role of copyright and how producers of literary property--authors and publishers--are to be compensated.

6) The extent to which published materials, both books and journals, are made accessible and actually used--or perhaps not used.

7) The disinclination of commercial publishers and university presses to risk publishing important books because of shrinking markets.

8) The rapidly growing costs of total library service resulting from the deluge of published information.

9) The fragmentation of the system itself and the absence of any overriding philosophy from which might develop a mechanism for interaction understood by all the component parts.

As the studies which will test these and other aspects of the hypothesis will evolve in the course of the investigation, it is difficult to anticipate the details of specific accomplishments. Nevertheless we venture to suggest some products of the Enquiry, of which the following seem obvious:

1) Recommendations to journal editors on methods of selection.

2) Information on the relation of rejection rates to quality.

3) Recommendations for mergers of journals.

4) Suggestions of experiments to be attempted in various fields (interest profile, etc.).

5) Recommendations for technological and bibliographical changes.

6) Information on the relation of academic promotion criteria and experience to post-publication evaluation.

7) Information on use patterns in libraries in relation to costs.

8) Information about the economic interrelation of paperbacks and hardbacks.

9) Recommendations concerning publishing certain material only in microform.

10) Suggestions for improving the bibliographic interrelation of publishers and libraries.

11) Recommendations to librarians and publishers relative to the present-day needs of scholars and serious students and readers.

Mr. Chairman, I think I will stop there. I have a lot more information on staffing, on the timetable we have and so on. I think some of those things can come out in the discussion if they are important.

* * * *

THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

Fritz Machlup
New York University

MR. HAAS: Our next speaker is Dr. Fritz Machlup. He will not remember this but I do: I first went to John Hopkins as Acquisitions Librarian in the early 1950's, and Professor Machlup was on the faculty at Hopkins at the time. One early spring day I was on an elevator in the then principal library building, and Dr. Machlup got on the elevator. He was wearing ski boots.

I did not know him at all well, but my curiosity had been provoked and I asked him why he was wearing ski boots. It turned out he was on his way to Switzerland for some obviously scholarly conference, and they weighed your luggage, so his lightweight oxfords were in his suitcase and he was wearing his ski boots. This established him as a practical economist in my mind at that time and that has been the case ever since.

His biography is in very small type and goes on for quite a way. I am not going to try and recapitulate what has been an obviously distinguished career as a scholar both abroad and in this country, with associations at Buffalo, Johns Hopkins and Princeton, and now an adjunct professor at New York University.

He has written a great many books but there was one sandwiched in 13 years ago in 1962. The title was The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States. It was followed by a book, Essays on Economic Semantics and preceded by An Economic Review of the Patent System. The 1962 book Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States was a real landmark book, because an economist was turning his mind to the whole process of generating, distributing and putting knowledge and information to use. Ever since that time the subject has never left Professor Machlup's scholarly interests.

He is at work right now. I think his current project started out to be an update of the 1962 book, but has probably evolved at this point in time to be something considerably more. Whereas the ACLS project is hopefully about to be born, the work that Dr. Machlup has been doing has, in fact, come kicking and screaming into the world and is well into early adolescence.

We did not put a specific title on Professor Machlup's talk. He suggested two; "The Economic Viability of Publishing and Library Services," or as an alternative, "Books, Journals and Libraries: A Hypothesis About an Economic Strangulation." I will let him take over at this point and describe to us what it is he is doing; how it relates to what he has done in the past; and what he will be expecting from the library community as he gathers information.

* * * *

MR. MACHLUP: Perhaps I may address you by saying: "Fellow Bibliophilists". Of course, I realize that a librarian may for a few minutes during the week become a bibliophobe, but this is only a few minutes usually, and day and night he is a bibliophile, and it happens that I am too.

Now one of the things in my life which makes me think that I have been a very lucky fellow is the fact that for 20 years now I have had my offices in a university library. That has always made me very, very happy. Now of course, you too have your offices in the library, but that is different. You are there as a provider of library services, while I have been there as a user of library services, and to be so close to the books is splendid for a user. I remember with special glee my years at Johns Hopkins, when the collection in history and in the social sciences was on the same floor with my offices, and I had to take about 20 steps to the stacks. It was simply superb. And, now during my 15 or 16 years at Princeton, I still have my offices in Princeton's library, thanks to William Dix. This has been a wonderful life for me. I have loved every aspect of my work experience, chiefly because of that.

I have been an avid user of library services, but also an active purveyor of library materials as a writer and as an editor. To these library-related activities as user and writer and editor, I have lately added a new one: I have become an investigator of library services and an economist engaged in research on the economics of library services. By this confession I may not endear myself to you, I am afraid, because while you live and work for the users of your services, and you accept that authors add to your collections and to your workload, and you even condone that editors augment the rapid flow of serials, you may look askance and with justified apprehension at an investigator who asks for statistical data about your own establishment, data which you may neither have nor know how you could obtain except by virtually intolerable efforts by those who want to know.

Now before I tell you about my evil designs, because some people will really find that these designs are more than they can swallow, I ought to talk to you about my past; I was told this might be important. While the older people among you may fully be acquainted with my work in the past, there are some people who are not quite that old, and they may not know what I have done in the past.

The sin that I committed and which I now have to confess is that from 1958 to 1962 I wrote a book which the Princeton University Press published in 1962, The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States. This was a 150-page book with about 85 statistical tables. It tried for the first time to get together all activities that could be considered as knowledge-producing or information-producing, not only to discuss each of these activities, but also to add: "How much do they cost?" and then to aggregate that whole thing and to ask: "How much do these knowledge-producing activities amount to in relation to the gross national product?" And while I have not the slightest idea what I would come out with, I was extremely

shocked and flabbergasted when the results were finally there before me. I could hardly believe them. I found that all of the things which I called the "knowledge industry" when added up were 30 percent of the gross national product. I also made a second study within the same covers of the book about the knowledge occupations.

Perhaps now is the time to say a word about what I meant by "knowledge industry" and "knowledge occupation". (Incidentally, these words have caught on; you read practically everyday now about the "knowledge industry". This was my coinage, and I had something quite different in mind when I coined it). I had two approaches to this study; one was what was the group output? There are groups which we might call "industries" or "branches of industries", and these groups have the purpose to produce information or knowledge. I make no differentiation between the word "information" and "knowledge"; the lexicographers do not either; they can not; it is completely arbitrary. "Information" is the act of conveying knowledge. The two things can be used interchangeably, if you mean the things that are known or about which you are informed.

Now there are these groups that really produce knowledge either for sale or at a cost because someone ordered it. And then there are individuals whose work consists in producing knowledge that means producing in somebody else's mind some awareness of things that he had not known before or had not known well before, etc. So there were the knowledge industries and the knowledge occupations, and these are two different things because a "knowledge industry" needs also people who are not working on producing knowledge.. A university and a university library needs some people who clean the floors. Now these poeple are not knowlege-producing. So you have nonknowledge producing workers in knowledge industries. And on the other hand, there are plenty of knowledge-producing people who are not working in a knowledge industry. There may be someone who is producing knowledge but works in a chemical plant, and so on. So these are two different things, and I was wondering, how do they relate? The knowledge industry was producing approximately 30 percent of the national product, and I found out that a little bit higher percentage of all the workers who are gainfully employed in the country were in the knowledge occupations. I tried to bring both these statistics together; this is a huge undertaking. I have to thank both the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, that have generously allowed me to have the research staff to do these studies.

I have not yet come to the aggregation of the knowledge industries as of 1970 or 1972. My past book did that for 1958, but I have just about finished my study of the knowledge occupations, and I saw that the things are going up and up and up. If I speak only of the people who are in the labor force, they are now I think near to 40 percent of the knowledge producing occupations, and if you include people who could be in the labor force, but instead are over 15 or 16 years old sitting in a school or at a college, then we have reached almost 50 percent. This is a large figure if you can think that half of the people in the United States are occupied in doing nothing but adding to knowledge -- their own knowledge, other people's knowledge. This is a large figure,

and it is terribly interesting to see how this changes from decade to decade.

I went back in this study to 1900 when the percentage was a very, very small one, and found that in 1910, 1920, and 1930 there was a constant growth. I do not say it can go on forever. I do not believe that it will reach the day when 100 percent of the population will be engaged in producing knowledge. I am not one to give projections into the future of things that ought not to be projected, or are projected only to show that it cannot be that way.

Perhaps one or two more words are needed of how I tried to organize my work on the knowledge industries or in the branches of that industry. I had five major categories. One was education on all levels and in all forms. It included on-the-job training, education in the home, and so on. The second was research and development. As a matter of fact, that was the first thing I did; this is how I came into that kind of study at all. The third big sector was media and communication, and there I had book publishing and everything that is connected with it. The next was information machines, because of office machines and computers and printing presses and typewriters, and all of these things. They are, of course, machines entirely devoted to the production and distribution of knowledge. The last one was called information services. I believe that expression was also coined by me and has caught on. There are now any number of journals, newsletters and outfits that have these terms among their titles, "knowledge industry", "information services", etc.

Incidentally, I still remember, partly with pleasure and partly with bewilderment, that Clark Kerr, then President of the University of California, used in his lectures at Harvard the expression "knowledge industry" which he had just read in my book. He used it and cited it, and as a good scholar, he made a footnote that this came from me. It was read or heard by people who did not know about my book. They felt "knowledge industry" suggested some modern educator, mass production of knowledge in universities where the students are mere numbers, etc. They were wild and furious at Clark Kerr for using the work "industry" in connection with something as esoteric and cultured as knowledge. Now this is merely an example of the misuse when you read without understanding and without going back to the source. Clark Kerr, of course, was completely innocent, and when he saw me the next time, he told me, "Look what kind of hole you got me into there."

Now I said that I was doing an updating of the whole undertaking, but for updating you need data. What I had in my original 1962 book was a rather aggregative kind of data. The publishing industry at best knew the total sales, the total input, etc., but I could not get any better breakdown than what Bowker had. Bowker, of course, is an excellent source, but the sources indicate how many books are in the fields, so you get it only in units not in money, etc. There was no possibility of making a real breakdown according to the kind of knowledge, if we speak now of scientific and scholarly knowledge.

I was asked by the Office of Science Information Service (OSIS) of the NSF whether I could not get the real data for the national input into scientific and technological information, to which was added also medical. Well, I said

I would try; I would undertake it. We had already started doing the kind of questionnaires that I would have to have filled out in order to get this from the publishers and from the indexers and abstracters and the libraries and so on.

When I learned about the ACLS' project, here was an idea to find out about scholarly knowledge. It appeared to me immediately to be an extreme waste that our group should study only "scientific". So, I said it would be imperative (that means it would be the only sensible thing to do) to make the study in one fell swoop. When I say "swoop", that looks as if it were to be done quickly; perhaps I should say in "one long seige," but definitely it should be "one". This is how it probably will turn out to be.

The National Science Foundation has agreed, in principle, on the money. The NEH has also agreed in principle, and we should hear soon how they feel about it. Let me immediately make one additional remark. At one stage they tried to get a "shotgun marriage" between the ACLS and us, and we were both quite willing to do it. It was almost an engagement. We said, "All right, let's get married." And then the NEH changed its mind and said, "No, let's get a divorce even before we get married." So the two studies will go on parallel but I hope, hand-in-hand and with a great feeling of frendship and mutual advice.

What I am very anxious to do, especially for books, is [to analyze the data] according to markets. You would not believe it but the publishers do not know exactly what kind of books serve what markets. Of course they have a very fine feeling in the tips of their fingers, but they do not have any numbers. There are no data that would tell you about the books in, say physics, or the books in mathematics or the books in literature; so much goes to college and university stores and so much goes into trade booksellers and so much is bought by wholesalers, and so on. Incidentally, if it sells to wholesalers, I have to get to wholesalers too to find out to whom they will sell the book.

This is the kind of information that is terribly important for the publishers themselves, and I hope they realize this and will cooperate with me in getting the data. In order to get the data incidentally, I found out that I have to do one thing; I cannot ask them, "Here is a questionnaire, please fill it out." First of all, it takes a lot of work and it deranges the whole office routine. They cannot tell people day-in-and-day-out, "Now stop doing everything and spend six weeks on filling out the questionnaires of Fritz Machlup." They just will not do it. So my new trick will be that I have a team that will go and descend upon the publishers one after the other and work on their books, on their records to get the information which we need. Then we will, of course, guarantee that there will be full confidentiality, and no one will know who gave what and from where does that come because that all will be aggregated in the end.

Now the libraries are, of course, a little bit easier, because there are not quite as many. There are many more publishers than there are research libraries. But the libraries are also a headache, not only to you but to me.

They are a headache because their own knowledge of their own work is very good in some places, but practically nonexistent in other places. There are some very outstanding libraries that have made several studies, and really have data that would be just right for us. They would know how many books they have and how many journals they have in different fields. They would have a breakdown by costs and so on. And of course they have also some interesting user studies; a user study is also one of the things that I have to do.

In addition to these libraries who have gone into studying their own operation, there are a great many that do not have that. And you would, for example, like to start and say, "Can you tell me about your total collection; how many books and how many serials do you have in this and that and that field?" Some will say, "Oh, we don't have that. We can give you an estimate of our total collection, and, even that estimate may not always be accurate."

In one place or the other, we heard something which was very sad. Somebody told me, "No, no. I don't know it and I don't want to know it." I say, "Why don't you want to know it?" "Well, you are telling me I ought to tell you how much I spend every year for physics and for romance languages and for history. If I knew that, that would leak out and these departments would get on me and say, 'You spend so much time for that and not for me.' and, I would have a war on my hands." This has actually happened, and I fully understand. I see the rationale, but on the other hand, I think it is exactly the kind of knowledge that we have to have. You see, when I say we need information, we need information not only to know; it is not that I am nosey; it is not because it is what, for want of a better word, is derogatory; it is not intellectual curiosity alone that speaks to it. It is a study for a purpose, and I would like to describe that purpose to you.

You know, when you say that you have to do a piece of research, the thing to do is first to say, "What hypothesis do you want to test?" And so I did jot down the set of hypotheses that I want to test. This is partly directly pointed to the publishers and partly to the librarians, but I hope you understand these two things are really so closely related that they can hardly be separated. Now here is the set of hypotheses:

1. The number of potential authors of manuscripts of books and journals has grown from 1950 to the present at a fantastic rate.

This is easy -- these figures are easily available if you know who the potential authors are. You merely look at the college faculties and the Ph.D's and so on.

2. The number of manuscripts regarded as publishable by traditional standards has increased at a similar or possibly faster rate.

3. The increase in the number of scientists and engineers

with advanced degrees or aspiring for academic positions is a major factor in the growth of the supply of manuscripts for publication. The increasing specialization in many scientific and scholarly disciplines may be another contributing factor, especially with regard to journals.

4. The spectacular increase or proliferation in the number of journals attests to increasing specialization.

Several fields have serious effects on library budgets. I have figures with me, though I will just give you one. In one library we studied, we found out that the acquisitions of serials, journals, or parts of serials, has had a share of about 40 percent of the acquisitions budget which has risen to 50 percent. This, of course, crowds out the share for books.

5. The number of potential buyers of books has grown from 1950 to recent years, first, probably at a rate comparable to the supply of publishable manuscripts, then at a decreasing rate and now it has about leveled out.

That means a no-growth figure. In some particular categories, it has even started to decline. As a proxy for potential direct or indirect buyers of books, I propose to use the number of students in elementary and secondary schools, the number of students in colleges and universities, the number of college graduates. Each, however, has different demands, different both with regard to the type of book and to the quantity of books purchased per year.

6. Competition among publishers, the brisk supply of manuscripts meeting existing standards of publishability and the increase in specialization in several fields resulted in a substantial increase in the number of titles published per year.

7. Increase in the number of titles combined with a smaller increase if not an absolute decline in some fields in the number of copies sold has made a decline in the number of copies sold per title inevitable.

8. The rapid increase in the costs of production of books has pushed up the break-even point for most titles. Yet instead of increasing the number of copies sold per title it declined rapidly, cutting profits and causing losses to publishers.

Statistical data for book publishing as a whole, and for library budgets as a whole is not difficult. However we need disaggregated data for particular fields or groups of fields, such as scientific and technological publications. But they do not exist; they have to be developed from the records of the

libraries, provided we will get access to all of these records or will be furnished the figures we need.

Now I have aggregate figures here which I might present, but I think I should not take much more time. I must say why these aggregate figures are practically worthless. We know the number of titles, but we do not know the different fields, nor to what extent different kinds of books -- let us say, workbooks and kinds of manuals and so on -- are included or not included. You probably know that practically speaking, there is not available statistical data on serials. We do not know how many serials are now published and how many have been published. We know (perhaps we will know better after a study of the libraries) how many subscriptions have been discontinued and how many subscriptions have been added. I know from some libraries already, that in the past few years the number of subscriptions added is smaller than the number of subscriptions discontinued, which of course, will pinch the publishers of journals and of serials.

I might also say that so many measures which the individual branches of the knowledge industry are taking to help themselves hurt their publishers. To give you an example, we know one of the great helps to the publishers is to charge a price for hardcover books different from paperbacks, which is quite different from the differential costs, chiefly binding. Why? Because they need that money. The libraries, of course, resent that greatly, and so what helps the publishers hurts the libraries. So we can do a great many things. The libraries try to help themselves doing things which hurt the publishers. This is exactly why these two studies are needed, so that we can finally devise remedies, or at least ideas for what can be done, so that we know what we should not do in areas where one thing may help at the expense of the other. We must try to find things that really help the entire group.

I wanted to say a few things about the use of studies. We, after all, publish and keep in the libraries things for the user. But what kind of use is being made of these things? You will be surprised if I tell you of a very simple study that I proposed as many as 15 years ago that has never been made. I, at that time, said: "Here you have the university presses and the university presses may publish things that do not have a wide market, but they, at least, have one market on which they counted--the university libraries." Most research libraries have standing orders, or at least buy most of the products of the university presses because these are really the well "refereed" books by good scholars and so on. But are these books ever read? They are printed in fine letter press with beautiful reproductions, with prizes given to the people who design them because they are really lovely. They are ornaments on the shelves of the libraries. But are they actually read? I suggested that we try to make a little study to see how often these books have been taken out. This is not a difficult study. A few undergraduates could do that. We take some titles of university press publications to find out. Well, I could not get anybody to be greatly interested in it. And I hope now, whether some one else is interested or not, I will do it.

I believe there are plenty of books that are published for prestige purposes or for very fine purposes, but that should not be published by letter presses and not sold at a high price. One should know that this information exists, and every scholar interested in it could write for it and he will get it in mimeographed form and so on. There is far too much publishing done now, and this is part of why the publishing industry is strangulated.

* * * *

REMARKS BY ROBERT LUMIANSKY

MR. HAAS: Before we begin the question period, I would like to have Robert Lumiansky talk very briefly about his interest and support of this project. Richard De Gennaro mentioned that when he came to the University of Pennsylvania, he found a very effective, strong advocate of libraries in Dr. Lumiansky, who was then Chairman of the English Department. Well, you remember I preceded Mr. De Gennaro at Pennsylvania, and Dr. Lumiansky learned everything I taught him. He is President of the American Council on Learned Societies and one of the country's leading spokesmen on scholarly matters, the interests of scholarship and, obviously, the interests of libraries themselves.

* * * *

MR. LUMIANSKY: First I would like to thank the Association for asking me to come down here and be with you. I have made friends of long-standing among you and have had opportunities to meet quite a number of new friends.

As you know, the ACLS and the Association of Research Libraries have long and close and, I think, highly effective relationships over the past years. And perhaps it suffices here for me to say that I am going to do all I can as the new President of the ACLS to see that that kind of close relationship continues. As you have heard this morning we are working at various aspects of the relationship now. I do not have a great deal to add to what has been put before you in the fine presentations already this morning.

I would like to try to make just one point. It seems to me, as we go into these two closely related efforts to work toward recommendations that will improve circumstances, that perhaps the fundamental key is the acceptance we can win on the part of the scholars of whatever recommendations we come up with. All of you live on university campuses. You know many, many scholars. Many of you are scholars yourselves, and I suspect that we, as scholars, are a little less quick to change our ways than perhaps some other segments of the population. I think, however, that from observation over the last two or three years, circumstances are becoming such that we, as scholars, realize the need for very marked changes in the system. And I am hoping that the ACLS, with its learned societies and its 92 associated universities, colleges and research libraries, can exert considerable influence to involve those persons represented in those entities in the on-going studies and to get the benefit of their advice, and also influence their way of thinking and the degree of acceptance which they will have for the recommendations when they come out.

I think of a couple of specific kinds of questions that I am sure many of you have in your mind. Take the circumstances of the young scholar in my own field, medieval studies, who does his dissertation, perhaps making a much-needed edition of a very important medieval treatise. This kind of scholarly job is hard. For one thing, he has to find out whether any manuscript not presently known does exist in any of the libraries in the Western world or elsewhere. He then has to do the tremendously time-consuming detail work of collating his manuscript and working toward an edition which will present the best manuscript as a base text probably, and then give the variances in the other manuscripts.

He has to write descriptions of his manuscripts; he has to write in the introduction an assessment of the importance of the particular treatise in the context of the 12th century or 15th century, wherever it happens to lie, and after some years of really devoted attention to such a problem, he comes up with his typed transcript which has to be checked, checked, checked and checked again, every letter along the way, to be sure he is not perpetrating errors.

If, for example, this happens to be a treatise that the Venerable Bede wrote on the very important medieval matter, "conception of time", there may be 300 of us in the world who hold that edition to be of vast importance. Now, traditionally, the young scholar, or old scholar if he is doing such work, hopes to see that book published in hard cover, say in the series that the Medieval Academy of America gets out or possibly in a series that the Early English Text Society gets out.

The question arises in studies such as you have heard described this morning as to whether it makes sense to publish that treatise in the traditional fashion or whether it is better, all things considered, to announce the availability and have the new edition of the treatise deposited somewhere so that copies and microfilms or photocopies or microcards or whatever, can be furnished easily and cheaply to the interested scholarly users. I think, in principle, we have to say it does not make sense to publish such work in the traditional hardcover way. It is no longer economically and perhaps even philosophically sensible, but there sits the young scholar, an assistant professor who is coming up for promotion. He has on his campus, first the departmental consideration of his promotion and tenure. He or she has the college committee on promotions and then, finally, the university committee. These committees have traditionally not been willing to grant that such a work made available in, say, microfilm, is the equivalent of a published book. There is always the assumption that if he could not get it published, it must not be worth anything; it must not be valuable. Well, these are the kinds of attitudes that I think we have to work toward trying to change, and somehow to get a realistic assessment of each item, step-by-step, and to find the most sensible ways of presenting such materials.

The same kind of questions from the point of view of the scholars applies to library services, of course. Scholars make a great point (and I would say from my own experience, to some degree rightly) that a great deal of

the help that they get out of libraries comes not from just having the single item that, after a given time, served them efficiently and expeditiously, but from the time that they spend "stacking" and coming almost by happenstance upon important things as they go down the rows, perhaps while looking for something else, finding books or journals of great importance to them. Thus, they argue that when a library enters into a cooperative acquisitions program with other libraries where each library buys only certain segments of books, then their work as scholars is very vastly hampered.

Well, I am not sure from what many of you tell me that even the richest of libraries can any longer try to do everything for everybody. There has to be some kind of cooperative division of the responsibility with the possibilities of relatively rapid exchanges. How schools are going to come to feel about such circumstances represents another one of these questions of attitude where, I think, the ACLS can be helpful in working toward better solutions than we now have.

* * * *

Discussion

MR. STUART-STUBBS: Considering the remarks I am about to make, I should mention, in addition to being a librarian at the University of British Columbia, I am the founder and director of the university press, and sometimes an author.

This morning, Mr. Booher spoke about some of the studies that would be undertaken, and he spoke about one that touches on the last speaker's remarks, "the motivation of the author." I think you were suggesting that he may not be driven by pure curiosity, but perhaps by some concern over his career. I think it is important that the study also investigate the motivations of publishers, both commerical and academic, and of libraries.

I hope you do that because as somebody who wears three hats part of the time, I am aware that sometimes I am motivated by one thing and sometimes by another; sometimes by noble motives and sometimes by ones not so noble.

MR. BOOHER: Well, I could not agree more, particularly on the publisher's side, which is the side I really have some feeling about. I have seen some kinds of motivation among publishers slowly drying up. One of my favorite speeches has to do with this. I fear for our own industry in terms of the kinds of young people we are attracting into it, and what their true motivations are.

One of the things that motivates me into getting into this study (and I must confess that after working for 40 years, one of the real questions on my mind is whether I want to work for 42 years) is the whole question of this system. You cannot talk about just the motivation of the scholar without talking about the motivation of the man who is going to publish the scholar's work, or the motivation of the librarian who is going to, in a sense, catalog and distribute it. This is where you get into the systems idea again.

As a publisher I have been on the fringe of some of the things that are happening in the technology of producing stuff, just enough to know that I think there can just be enormous steps forward in this, and I am eager to get into that in a way that I have not been able to from where I sit. I was reminded of this when Mr. Lumiansky spoke about this very important medieval document. Those 300 copies are terribly important, whether it is going to be in microfilm or hard print or what it is going to be.

I think some new things in the technology lie ahead of us, not only in the technology of producing it, but equally important, in the technology of distributing it. That is where our real money goes in my business -- in the marketing and distribution side. That is where it has been even up to today for the university presses. These are some real knots, but I think they are the things we can get our hands on and make real headway in. And if we can solve them, then not only the university presses, but I hope the commercial presses can go back to the concept of the purist doing the services he is supposed to be rendering. That is the real reason why I became a publisher, not just to publish four million copies of Samuelson's Economics, which I am proud to have done and which has made my salary and a lot of other salaries around McGraw-Hill and helped us publish other books, but to make sure we do publish other books out of that.

MR. WILLIAMS: My comments really go back to the first part of Mr. Booher's talk where he quoted his own speech to the European publishers. I was particularly struck with his remarks, as I understand it, that publishers should join with librarians in demanding more money for libraries so that they can give the authors and the publishers more money and more royalties, and then, going on from that to the study that is proposed.

What I perhaps missed was any concern in that study for that amorphous, ill-defined, perhaps mythical structure ("mythical" in the sense that it does not really exist), the public. That is, the concern that seems to me ought to be some place in this, is not to get more money for publishers and authors as the primary goal, but the primary goal, in fact, should be to decrease the cost to society in general, of access to information. Maybe I missed it, but I hope in any case, whether it was there or whether I missed it, that it would be included.

The other comment has to do with copyright, in which I have been struck by what seems to me to be a positive fact that deserves some study, and this is the fact of the effect of this peculiar grant of a copyright monopoly on the economics of publishing, and how much of the publishing now going on is in fact the result of publishers' copyright monopoly. In order to get more of a share of the market, each individual publisher rushes out to issue a book which does not really add substantially -- it is really a repackaging of other information -- simply because the copyright monopoly prevents him from competing himself with the same product in one way or another. I suspect that the unintended effect of copyright monopoly may become deleterious in this respect.

MR. MACHLUP: The problem that you mentioned last about duplication -- to publish a similar book which competes with another that is copyrighted -- also has its parallel in the patent system where there is the so-called problem of "inventing around"; someone has invented something for a certain purpose; this is protected. Here is a monopoly. There are plenty of people who are trying to invent something which is sufficiently different so that they can get a patent, but the invention will do exactly the same as the first one has been doing. These are problems the profession has been trying for several hundred years to solve. We have not yet found out what to do about it. There have been people who have said: "This is terrible and you must get rid of it."

There must be the compulsory licensing of patents, and similar things might be proposed for copyright, but we do not know what. Let me say this: There is one great trouble with all these kinds of things, especially with the copyright thing. Congressional hearings have been going on every since the beginning of copyrights in the United States. These hearings are always with witnesses called that were either authors or the publishers or someone who has a pecuniary interest in the issue. There has never been an attempt by Congress to get a group of people to put their minds on it who have no pecuniary interest in it; that is one of the troubles. There is in the entire economic literature, perhaps a handful of good pieces about copyright and that is all.

MR. BOOHER: First there is the "public". Good heavens, yes! For the university to publish means to "make public". So there is something in that study too about the public. We are concerned with it. My comments, I would remind you again, which I made in Frankfort, were to some very hardline guys who are unlike the U.S. or commercial publishers and are primarily journalists. In size and technology most of the primary journals in Europe are done by commercial people. I was trying to move them a little bit. I think I succeeded somewhat. I heard the other day that we are now even entertaining the idea of having as our principal speaker at our next General Assembly coming up in October a librarian. Believe me, we would not even let them in the room prior to this.

On monopoly of copyright itself, one of the most hopeful things I have heard about for a long time concerns a very gifted univerity press director, Leon Seltzer at Stanford University Press, a very, very able person with a very wide-ranging, inquiring mind, who has just been given a Guggenheim fellowship to do a study on the philosophical roots of copyright and try to explore this basic concept. Mr. Seltzer as I say, is a gifted person; in addition to being a first-class university publisher, he is a scholar. He also just recently has obtained a law degree, which means he, at least, is learned in the techniques of finding his way around in the maze of something we call "law", and I think this can be very meaningful for all of us. I am looking on his work as having a real input to some of the things we hope to get to.

MR. MILCZEWSKY: Is either of the studies that you gentlemen are going to be

involved in going to pay attention to what I call the "gatekeeping" function -- that is, review by competent scholars of publications which are being proposed, or the next step, which is the editorial function, which is a very painstaking one in the scholarly publications? I do not mean to imply that I want to see any censorship, because anybody ought to be able to publish anything he wants, but reputable publishers to whom we turn ought to have some kind of consistency about what they do in order to assure us and to assure the scholars we serve that the material actually is worth our buying and their reading.

MR. BOOHER: I have said here this morning in this list of items that we think are important for this enquiry in its total dimension, that number two was Quality Control in Research, and number three was Quality Control in Published Research and this is precisely what we are talking about. Now that is a very ticklish subject to get into, but we do want to review methods of review and everything that has to do with it, and everything that is connected with what goes into the final decision on what to publish and what not to publish. Whether we can come up with recommendations, guidelines or not, I do not know. But this is absolutely basic and underpins an awful lot of everything we are going to do, more so in journals than in books, but in both.

MR. MACHLUP: If I may add one word to this. I believe the crux is not the quality control but the use control, because some splendid things are being published which have only a very limited number of users. I have been on editorial boards of journals and of a university press, and I would say that there was nothing wrong with the quality control. I believe nothing really got by. The "gatekeepers" were there and were watchful, but what they did not look out for was how large is the audience for which they were publishing.

This, if I may say so, gets back to the whole systems concept. You go back to the point, where does the pressure to publish something originate; from whom does it originate. You know there are a whole lot of things that take place before it reaches the stage we are talking about. These are some of the things we hope we can not only look to, but make some recommendations that will have some impact.

MR. LUMIANSKY: I think that one of the crucial aspects of this last comment is to be found under the heading that we call "Proliferation of Learned Journals". In the field of modern language and literature statistics indicate there has been a great increase in the numbers of journals.

Now, how do most of those journals come about? A group of people in a given English Department finds a community of interest in a subdivision of the field of English literature. They go to their dean and say: "We want to start a learned journal." Well, the dean wants to increase the prestige of the institution, and he starts looking around for some money to help produce the learned journal. The first thing you know you get a PMLA announcement that such and such an institution is founding such and such a journal

and invites submissions. The refereeing in such a circumstance is very, very open to criticism. First of all, the people down there on that campus naturally feel the journal offers them an outlet for what they write, and then their friends submit articles, and in most cases there is practically no refereeing.

We have talked some with presidents of institutions and with deans and they keep telling us: "We are almost powerless in the face of such pressure from given segments of the faculty." It is true now with limited budgets they can say: "We simply don't have money to raise your salary, much less to create a learned journal."

But if you will look at the statistics for the last year, you will find about 25 new journals in the field of language and literature. The latest one I have seen is from a relatively small college announcing that there will be a new journal called Milton and the Romantics. That is the name of a quarterly, learned journal. We do not need any quarterly to publish Milton and the Romantics; there are plenty of places where good articles in that area can be published. It is quality control in these circumstances that means: "Don't establish the journal." And we think that we can get the word about in such a fashion to do some good in that area.

MR. McDONALD: Mr. Booher in his comments quote Barbara Ringer's concern for authors on the one hand and readers on the other. I think we are all concerned with authors and their just due. We are all concerned with readers and their just due. But I feel that that is a very simplistic view of what we are listening to here today.

Are not we really concerned with another group, the scholars, whose motivations may vary widely, but who, by and large, are interested in communicating their scholarship to others and not, primarily at any rate, in royalty payments or profits? And I think it is this that has caused librarians, on the one hand, to kind of dig in their heels and say: "We don't really think that any additional costs of photocopying should be charged and paid for by us or alternatively passed along to our users." And I really do believe that most librarians are not speaking for themselves or do not feel that they are speaking for themselves in this controversy, but are trying to represent that large public that Gordon Williams alluded to that is out there.

MR. DE GENNARO: I am pleased to hear a distinguished publisher like Mr. Booher calling for harmony rather than conflict in this area, but there seems to me to be a new generation of information industry people coming in who are changing this kind of argument, charging this discussion with a kind of emotional and even silly comments and speeches and so on. I am referring specifically to the recent meeting of the Information Industry Association when we heard their leading spokesman talking about "iron curtains of free information dropping down around us," and I wonder if there is anything that can be done to decrease this change in climate and get the discussion back to reasonable people talking to each other.

MR. BOOHER: I do not know too much here except that I suspect that among the people whom we will go to in this study for advice on a panel basis will be this group, and there will have some of these commercial guys in it. I think we have to include them, if no more than to try to unscramble their thinking or have them unscramble ours.

Let me go back and say one more thing about the organization of the study itself, because I think this is important to some of the questions that were raised. First, we hope to have a very strong board made up of the constituents with interests in this study. We have a sizable list, it seems to me, of first-class people who will serve on the Board. But beyond that, I think one of the places we are probably going to have to start is with the organization of advisory panels very early on, and maybe even before we get the study underway to sit down with groups of people of the kind we have been talking about here and get their counsel, their advice, "pick their brains" for direction and help, and to stay with people of that kind all the way through. The advisors in this project are really not going to be expert in anything. Certainly, I am not. Maybe as a commercial book publisher I have some expertise, but the associate director of this project will be, I hope, an economist who knows how to investigate, collect, arrange and analyze data, as will our researchers.

So we are going to have to constantly go to the field, to the constituent audience that we hope this study will serve, and be helped and guided by what they can bring to us.

MR. BOES: One of the areas that was not touched on in the discussion are which areas are going to be more important in the study than other areas? To be specific, one of the areas I am quite concerned about is the new distribution methods that are going to be occurring in the future. I think this is one of the concerns of the Information Industry. There are ways of bypassing us; there are also ways of us bypassing the publishers -- "us" being the scholarly world. What I am concerned about is this going to be a priority in the study?

MR. HAAS: I can say as a working member of that Task Force, yes, the ACLS study is really looking at the interfaces between the scholarly world and publishing world, and the published records and abstracts and research librarians, etc., knowing full well the action being taken by libraries, for example, to run a national lending library of journals in Chicago, has "ripple effects" in all directions.

There is obviously the prospect of a pool of microfilm being, in a sense, the basis for a kind of secondary publishing effort, and this might well prove to be of great advantage to a lot of publishers as well, because it will relieve them of the warehousing problems of old single issues and billing problems of replacement issues. etc. Yes, all aspects of this are implicit in this study.

MR. SKIPPER: I predict, and in fact, it is perfectly predictable that at

least Mr. Booher is going to get a lot of suggestions to add to this "shopping list". I have one that may be worthy of consideration, although I doubt if you can formalize a solution to the problem. The question is the unstructured transfer of information. Some of the National Science Foundation studies indicated that scientists, for instance, obtain a large proportion of their information from conferences, that is, not only by the formal presentation of papers, but by being able to talk to colleagues in the conferences. Mr. Haas has earlier alluded to the "invisible" college -- that is, the senior people communicating directly with each other through long-distance telephone lines or photocopy or the carbon chain.

We in the academic library field are fully aware of different levels of information uses, with the senior scholars using information in a much different way than the assistant professor trying to achieve tenure. And being a member of the visiting committee of hospitals and medical schools, I also query the senior doctors about how they get their current information on operational techniques and drugs. The curious thing -- this is not statistically valid -- but many told me they were obviously very busy and literature research was prohibitive as far as their time was concerned. They found it most useful to attach themselves to a very bright, perceptive intern and query this chap on his rounds, because that individual was in touch with the information because of the level of his activities at the present time. Is this a legitimate area of concern or interest to these studies?

MR. BOOHER: It is a legitimate area, but how to do it is hard.

MR. ROVELSTAD: I would like to ask Professor Machlup what he anticipates may be the outcome of his studies; what kind of conclusions might you be working toward; do you anticipate that there will be recommendations produced from your study?

MR. MACHLUP: I would say that I shall stay away personally from including in a report any recommendations. I think I will probably discuss various alternatives, but I will not become a champion of any plan, because that would discredit, probably, the value, or, let us say, the respect for the data and the information that I provide. I will try to get the information and get it analyzed in such a way that it will be most helpful in the evaluation of various remedial measures, but I shall not arrogate the making of proposals by which the "strangulations" could be avoided. It is, I believe, a good division of labor, even if the same man does one thing in two pieces. In this piece, I shall make a fact-finding study trying to test the various hypotheses and to say it looks that way to me. Whether I, myself, or others will then utilize these pieces of information for making their proposals, I cannot tell. I, myself, if I am still alive, will be very happy to do so.

MR. LUMIANSKY: I would simply like to say that I hope you realize that everything Dr. Machlup has already done and proposes to do underpins very greatly many of the things we plan to do in our enquiry, and his studies are going to be of primary and pertinent and prominent importance to us. Going beyond that, I hope that we will make some recommendations probably

based on what his data reveals.

MR. HAAS: Now the 30-second summary. As I said, I refused, but it is evident as I have listened here, and as I have worked with some of these people in this process, that certain things are required.

First, we need to develop and maintain a continuing forum so that the public interest might be guarded and policies as they evolve might mature in a proper way. Obviously, there needs to be some agency, some group of people -- not necessarily a single group -- that will really assume responsibility for moving us in directions that make sense. We need a fiscal support structure for a new program that really will cross the traditional boundaries of each element of the system, at least until the system itself is recast. We need effective articulation from the leaders in all areas here regarding some of the underlying principles that should serve as a touchstone for action in the future. Perhaps most of all, we need to be reminded time and time again that information is not really a commodity, and that recorded knowledge is, in a sense, the substance of civilization, and that all of us here and many others with whom we work have a fundamental responsibility to maintain the integrity of that system in the future. Thank you very much. That is the end of this session.

* * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

MR. DE GENNARO: I would like to open the business meeting with Commission reports. I am going to pass over the Commission on the Development of Resources chaired by Gustave Harrer and the Commission on Organization of Resources, Edward Lathem, chairman. Both of those Commissions for one reason or another have really not much to report. They are having their meetings tomorrow. One of the disadvantages of having the business meeting this afternoon instead of at the close of the two-day meeting, is that we lose the possibility of getting full reports from them. But we do have reports from two of the Commissions: the Commission on Access and the Management Commission.

* * * *

Commission on Access to Resources

[The Commission report is included as Appendix A of these Minutes].

MR. BOSS: I am not sure our Commission is much better off than the other two in that its former Chairperson has gone to bigger and better things recently. Virginia Whitney did such a good job with two of us, that she is now going to become your president and try her hand with 100 of you.

The Commission has continued in basically the same vein, that is, examining access. We have determined that there are really two or three basic concerns: access to external resources -- those outside the institution, and access to resources within the institution. The external area seems to be well provided for with the completion of the Westat studies on interlibrary loan. "A Strategy for Communications Among Library Systems," a draft proposal which ARL has recently submitted for funding to the National Science Foundation, is also in the works and will be mentioned in greater detail later during this meeting.

Other activities regarding access include the work of the Task Force on a National Periodical Resources Plan and some discussion on the part of the Interlibrary Loan Committee on whether or not by interlibrary loan we really are meeting all of the needs that cannot be met within the institution, and whether interlibrary loan in many institutions is very much on the periphery of people's attention.

The Commission has sought to focus instead on the other side of the coin; access to internal resources. We recognize that there might be a number of obstacles in most of our libraries to this access because of a cataloging backlog, a filing backlog, removal of cards from the card catalog, the condition of the stacks, reshelving time, or what have you. We have identified about a dozen and a half of these, and have discussed them and talked with the Office of Management Studies about the possibility of sending out a SPEC survey, to ascertain to what extent these obstacles exist in

libraries, and also to determine what efforts have been made to minimize them. The SPEC survey, when published, would hopefully then share this information in terms of how libraries have addressed these issues and indicate the extent that they have not been successfully addressed.

The next step would be to seek to encourage individual libraries to undertake some fairly pragmatic research in these areas, each library being rewarded hopefully by the fact that other libraries would be undertaking research in complementary areas. Whether or not there is the expertise or wherewithal within the member libraries to undertake this research, it might be appropriate to engage a contractor for the purpose. The appropriate coordinating agency for the project under those circumstances might be the Office of Management Studies.

Our purpose would be to meet with the Office of Management Studies between now and ALA in San Francisco with the view to getting a SPEC survey out this summer, and having the results in time for this Commission to make a report to you in September for discussion at the October meeting of the Board and the membership.

* * * *

Commission on Management of Research Libraries

MR. McELDERRY: As most of you know, the responsibility of the Management Commission is to identify issues for investigation that would be conducted by committees or task forces. It also serves as an advisory committee to the Office of Management Studies. As I reported to you at our January meeting, most of our energies this past year were spent trying to keep the Office of Management Studies alive. As you may recall, its current funding was to expire in September of this year. In addition to contacting the Council on Library Resources for continued support, we tried to look at various ways in which the Office could derive income from products that it had created in response to various issues in management, and also to seek further subsidies from the ARL Office itself.

The Office of Management Studies at the January meeting of this Association and last night in a sort of rump session, had a rather comprehensive assessment of its activities over the past four or five years. The response of the membership has generally been very satisfactory. Rather than give you a secondhand report of the current status and activities of the Office, I thought I would perform in the tradition of Warren Haas and just introduce to you Duane Webster, who directs this Office in a very able and imaginative way, who will tell you what he is currently up to and what he is planning in the future.

MR. WEBSTER: The key development in our recent existence, of course, is the award by the Council on Library Resources of a continuation grant to the Office. The Council is going to continue their support for this management type of activity at the Association at the level that we have asked for -- $210,000 -- for the next three years, so that we will be able to continue

the basic program operation that we have had over the last several years.

That program operation includes research and development activity, characterized in the past by the Columbia Study, the Management Review and Analysis Program, the study of machine-readable data bases project that we worked on with NASIC. The second basic program that we operate is the information clearinghouse type of activities, characterized in this instance by the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center which we will continue. The third basic program is organizational training. We have been holding workshops, sponsoring fellowships and preparing training materials such as the training film program, which I think you are aware of.

I might mention briefly some of our thinking at this point in terms of directions we may take, largely in response to your interests as expressed in the assessment survey conducted this last winter. One of the major areas that we are working on is with the Access Commission, as Richard Boss mentioned. Our work here is really focused on trying to take the review and analysis technique and see whether or not that technique can be used to look at the services Mr. Boss suggested, looking initially at some of the obstacles to service, at some of the success and failure patterns that occur in a large research library. Our thinking is that maybe the best way to start on that type of project is through a SPEC survey, but with a longer term view of really looking at the entire services functions, with a view toward improving our capabilities in that area.

Another project that is on the drawing board presently is a cooperative project that we are developing with McGill University Libraries. In this area we are looking at the problem of supervisory training as it applies to implementation of a performance appraisal program. We are going to be working with some of the McGill staff during the course of this summer in detailing exactly how that training project might operate.

A third new direction of the Office in this area of management training is a management skills institute. We recently sent you some descriptive information on this institute which is going to be held in Philadelphia this summer. On the basis of our experience we will make a judgment as to whether we will hold additional institutes or other types of training programs of this nature.

The one other activity that we are very interested in right now might well be characterized as a tool called a performance audit. This involves looking at some way of taking the needs assessment, and study activity involved in a very ambitious undertaking such as the Management Review and Analysis Program, and telecope that down into something that more libraries could use with less time and staff commitment. We are not sure exactly what direction that might go, but it is something that we are looking at very closely in conjunction with the Management Commission.

Again, as we indicated last night and during the assessment survey, we are actively seeking your ideas and reactions to some of the work of the Management Office. Your comments and your questions would be appreciated.

* * * *

Report of the Committee on University Library Standards

[The Committee report is included as Appendix B of these Minutes].

MR. DE GENNARO: I think we can move now to committee reports. The first one is the Joint ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards, which has been chaired by Robert Downs and has as its other members, Clifton Brock, Gustave Harrer, John Heussman, Jay Lucker, John McDonald, and Ellsworth Mason. Mr. Downs and his committee have worked on this document for quite some time. As you will recall, they made a presentation at the January meeting. The report has been extensively revised this spring. Mr. Downs will present the new version which you all received by mail in April, and which I hope that you all had a chance to read.

As was indicated at the January meeting, the Association will be given an opportunity after the Downs presentation to express itself on whether or not the ARL wants to approve the idea of developing this report into a standard. In my view, and I think that you will probably agree with me, this meeting is not the time or the place to debate the pros and cons of the various elements in the report. I do not think that we have time or inclination to do that; I do not think it would get us very far. The Board had an extensive discussion of this report yesterday at its meeting, and finally arrived at a consensus which we think and hope may reflect the views of the membership. So the Board, in effect, is going to recommend, after Mr. Downs makes his report, a kind of adoption of the report in principle and then suggest that further work be planned. I will give you the language of the Board resolution later, but first I would like to call on Robert Downs to present this report.

MR. DOWNS: As Mr. De Gennaro has noted, the preliminary report of the Joint Committee on University Library Standards was presented at the ARL meeting in Chicago last January. In the discussion a number of constructive suggestions were offered and later correspondence and conversations with various individuals produced further recommendations for changes or revisions. So the revised edition of the committee report now in your hands has taken note of many of these suggestions. It was not feasible to include them all, partly because they are sometimes in conflict with each other, and sometimes they run directly contrary to the general approach or, one may say, the philosophy of the report.

It may be useful to identify the areas in which the principal revisions have been made. The first section "Significance of University Libraries" is new and is an attempt to provide a proper setting for a statement of standards. Also new, in response to urgings of several knowledgeable individuals, is the second section dealing with library cooperation. There continues to be a belief on the part of some that qualitative are to be preferred to quantitative standards. All suggestions in that direction, however, remain nebulous and extremely difficult to apply in practical situations. The emphasis, therefore, continues to be on specific, concrete criteria. Incidentally, it may be noted the ARL's own membership criteria are entirely quantitative.

The basic areas in which the adoption of standards is proposed remain the same: resources, personnel, space, finance, public service and administration. On page six of the report, attention is called to the importance of a library's location. Several individuals commented on that idea, though exactly how this factor may affect standards is unclear, probably calling for individual judgments in each instance. On page 13, paragraph 2, a method of counting microforms as volumes is discussed for the benefit of libraries which are committed to this practice. Notice that the idea is not endorsed or recommended.

On page 16 the first full paragraph is a discussion of staffing of technical services, and for the reasons mentioned the idea of any fixed formula for staffing has been dropped. As mentioned, the whole field is in a state of transition, and its long range or final shape is yet to be determined.

Under the heading of "space" on page 19, additional formulae have been inserted for measuring the requirements of certain types of material, and on page 24, several steps are proposed for the management of book funds in conformity, I believe, with the best modern practices.

Sections on pages 6 and 27 relating to the centralization and decentralization of library services have been developed more fully than in the preliminary report, taking account of a number of discussions. Also somewhat expanded is the final section on administration, especially item six dealing with the makeup and enrollment of faculty-student library committees.

Now it is obvious, I think, that the committee's report is hardly suitable for adoption as a code of standards in its present form. We have here an amalgam of definitions, discussions and explanations, along with proposed specific standards. The statement of standards should probably be separated and the definitions, discussions and explanations appended to clarify doubtful points. And so for the purposes of today's meeting, it is my hope a committee will be appointed to formulate a code based on the report.

MR. DE GENNARO: Thank you very much, Mr. Downs. As I said earlier, at their May 6, 1975 meeting the Board discussed at length the report of the Joint ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards. We very soon gave up the idea of trying to discuss the actual content, the very specific standards that were being outlined in the report, and rather turned to the question of trying to decide whether or not the Board should recommend to the Association that the whole effort of creating standards for university libraries should be pursued. We finally came to a conclusion, and I will read you the language of the resolution that we agreed to:

> It was recognized that efforts to establish standards for university libraries will be continued by the Association of Colleges and Research Libraries, and that the Association of Research Libraries would want to participate in the formulation of these standards. The Board found merit in the report of the Joint Committee, particularly in providing a good basis

for further efforts to develop university library standards.

The Board passed a resolution:

1) that the Committee report be received by the Association;

2) with the completion of their difficult assignment, the Joint Committee be discharged with an expression of appreciation for their work;

3) the ARL Executive Director be instructed to discuss with appropriate representatives of the ACRL the next steps to be taken to build upon the work of the Joint Committee.

In order to facilitate our discussion here, I will offer this as a resolution to the Association in the hope that the membership will endorse the Board's position in this matter. By way of further explanation of the Board's position on this matter, I would like to call on William Dix, who is a member of the Board, to have him give some further views on this.

MR. DIX: I can be very brief. I would like simply to second this resolution, to endorse it. This may come as a surprise to some of you who will remember that at the last meeting I rose to the floor to oppose the whole idea of standards for university libraries. I want to simply explain what happened to my thinking on this; it may be of help to you in thinking it through.

In the first place, I think this draft of the committee report goes quite some way toward responding to some of my objections in terms of specifics. It by no means does all -- as a matter of fact, I think this draft has introduced a couple of more problems that I have trouble with, but we are not here to discuss those. I think, though, it does indicate how, in a somewhat more discursive fashion a document of this sort can be an extremely useful guide in a variety of ways.

The second and more important point, though, it seemed to me was this: in our discussion in the Board, I became convinced particularly by the representatives of state universities, that whether we like it or not we are going to have a variety of kinds of formula budgeting, of standards of one kind or another imposed on us from without, from state agencies and so forth, and to some extent this may be true even in the nonpublic institutions. We do have here an opportunity to begin to mold something that is more to our own liking, and that we think will fit the purpose.

So with some hesitation still in my own mind about all the implications of this, I have come to the conclusion that this is a good thing, and that this resolution moves us on in the right direction. Again, without endorsing some of the specifics, I find myself able to urge the members to vote for the resolution.

MR. DE GENNARO: We will entertain discussions from the floor.

MR. MILCZEWSKI: We are still struggling with the draft and we have not really sent in our comments; to whom shall we address any other comments we may have?

MR. DE GENNARO: They should be sent to John McDonald. It was the Board's intention to have Mr. McDonald carry the ball on this until we were able to appoint a new ARL group to work on it.

I think we cannot move until ARL has said their piece on this document. Just as soon as they have, hopefully within the next few months or so, we would like to build on the work that Mr. Downs and his group have done here, and push this thing forward to a conclusion. This is definitely not a stalling action. We are not in that frame of mind. So send your letters and comments in to John McDonald.

MR. LORENZ: On page two, I would like to make sure that some reference to federal assistance is included in the document, and ask the question whether this was considered and discarded, or whether it still is a possibility for addition? Specifically, at the end of paragraph two on page two there is a reference that "research resources of American university libraries are a matter of national concern." But then in the following paragraph the only reference is to a system of state subsidies, and I would like to recommend that at the end of that paragraph a sentence be added, such as: "Federal assistance for library and information service programs of national significance and regional resources and service centers is also an important element in present and future library development."

MR. DOWNS: On the first point regarding the second paragraph, the comments there grew out of work that the university libraries of the country actually have been doing within the last 25 years with the Library of Congress. Those particular considerations, I think, are directly derived from such projects as the Wartime Cooperative Acquisition Project and the present program for cataloging and acquisitions. It is, I think, an oversight that federal subsidies are overlooked in the third paragraph, if there is any such thing now in existence. The impression was that federal subsidies have almost disappeared so far as university libraries are concerned. It would be very appropriate to include federal libraries in that statement.

MR. DE GENNARO: I think we have a record of the language of the sentence suggested, and I think it is very appropriate.

MR. ROVELSTAD. I am not sure this is a detail which should be discussed here or not, but in answer to the question on page three "What Is A University?" I did question point number one; the basis seems to be in terms of federal financial support of academic science. I am wondering why we are talking about federal financing, rather than financing in general of a university program.

MR. DOWNS: Well, this is purely pragmatic. We have something here on which

to draw and I do not know of a comparable list issued by any other institution. Certainly the institutions which are primarily great universities with research contracts are deeply involved in science, almost without exception.

MR. DE GENNARO: We have with us Beverly Lynch and William Axford. Beverly Lynch is the Executive Director of ACRL and William Axford is the President; I wonder if either one of them want to comment on ACRL's attitude toward this comment.

MR. AXFORD: We have here two members of our committee: Hugh Atkinson and Vern Pings. That committee will not come before the ACRL Board before the San Francisco meeting, and our consideration until there is some Board action is unknown.

Since you have got me up here, I might want to put in a comment that has nothing to do with my position with ACRL, but just as a member of ARL, and as one who is going through the pressures from outside agencies for funding standards right at the moment. The State of Oregon now has a committee called CORA, Committee on Resource Allocation. (It used to be called COBRA which I thought was a better name for it). We are using whatever we can get our hands on and having some success, related to getting them to accept certain funding standards. But there is one thing that has been bothering me about working with CORA, and that bothers me a little bit about not only the document produced by the Downs Committee, but about others of the same kind. Mostly these documents talk about the resources that libraries need to do the job that has to be done, and they develop various standards for the funding of libraries. But I have never seen any yet that had anything in there that would be a different type of standard, and that would be a performance standard in the sense of how well are libraries using what resources have been and will be allocated to them. I think in selling a document such as this or others that we worked with, there is a matter of credibility. Most standards such as this would have an enormous impact on many library budgets in terms of increases for books, acquisition, personnel and such. And I cannot see, working in the political arena as we are now, how these standards that would involve vastly increased funding at this particular time are going to have too much credibility unless we have got a standard on how well we are using what we have.

MR. DE GENNARO: Thank you very much, Mr. Axford. Does anyone else have any comments or questions?

All in favor of endorsing the Board's resolution as I read it please indicate by saying "aye". [A vote was taken. The resolution was endorsed].

That moves us on that very critical question of standards. I just want to take a moment to thank Mr. Downs again and his committee for the tremendous piece of work that they have done on this document. I believe that this is going to form the basis for a really solid set of standards for university libraries.

* * * *

Committee on Access to Manuscripts & Rare Books

MR. DE GENNARO: We are ready for the report of the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books chaired by Ray Frantz. This report was distributed by mail to the entire membership. It has two statements[1]: "Access to Original Research Materials in Libraries, Archives and Manuscript Repositories", and "Reproduction of Manuscripts and Archives for Noncommercial Purposes." I call on Ray Frantz to give us that report.

MR. FRANTZ: The purpose, intent and scope of the Committee's work were described at the Chicago meeting, so I will not review that. You have all read the two statements so I will not reread those. Rather I would just like to say as we put these before you for your adoption, that these statements do not say this is the only way you can go about forming your policies for access to your manuscripts and rare books collection, nor is it the only way you can go about formulating policies regarding having them reproduced. It is mainly to support your policies and to have a statement before us so many of our libraries will not feel isolated in refusing demands that we may feel are unreasonable to our staffs or to the preservation of our collections, or to our responsibility as to how much we should inform a person of the literary rights or of collections available, or of parallel research. So these are designed as statements for your help.

If you approve these, our next step is to get in touch with the Society of American Archivists and the ACRL. I have talked with Beverly Lynch, Clyde Walton and Hendrik Edelman to see if we can agree on one statement. Hopefully, they can accept this one so that the profession can be represented by one statement instead of three, which I think will strengthen our hand. If that comes about, then a majority of our committee is anxious to approach the American Historical Association (AHA) who already has a committee greatly concerned about the way scholars are handling manuscripts, about preservation and concerned that irresponsible handling will increase a library's militancy regarding access. So they are in a very good frame of mind to be approached. And we feel that if we could go to them with a statement that outlines an approach that our membership has approved and have them acknowledge this statement, it would do a great deal to bridge the misunderstanding and sometimes hostility that now exists between libraries, archives and the scholarly world. Then the next step might be to approach the Modern Language Association (MLA).

As I said, the reason we would like to go to AHA first is they do have a committee set up to look at this problem. MLA does not, but we will take this a step at a time so that a chain of events can be set into motion once we have your approval of these two statements.

MR. DE GENNARO: Thank you very much, Mr. Frantz. This item was also dis-

---

[1]See appendices H and I of the Minutes of the 85th Meeting of the ARL, January 18, 1975, for the statements referred to here.

cussed by the Board, and the Board voted to endorse the report of the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books, and to recommend that the ARL membership adopt these two statements. I would like to move that the membership endorse these statements. Is there any discussion?

MR. SPARKS: I have two reservations about this document. One of them concerns literary rights. I have an Assistant Archivist who is both a Ph.D and Doctor of Jurisprudence. Notre Dame has had a problem with literary rights. We have the Sherman papers and are in the process of negotiating literary rights to these papers, a matter of consulting 130 descendants of General Sherman. We have not undertaken this effort lightly. We recognize the difficulty, but it is a legal problem. I am a little bit nervous about adopting a proposal which would perhaps put us at variance with the law with respect to literary property rights. That is one of my objections.

There was another point which I do not think was discussed by the committee, and it was one which we were particularly concerned with at Yale in the archives. We were careful not to introduce a researcher into an archive without first telling him of other researchers who might already be working on that archive. It is a problem of competitive scholarship and the duplication of work. We felt that this was a necessary management control of the archives which perhaps should be in this document, and I do not find it here.

MR. FRANTZ: On the first point, there is nothing in the statement to prohibit your undertaking the very wide responsibility of literary rights. You can or cannot do that, as you choose.

Regarding the second point, the committee talked about this and felt it should not be in the document; it should be a common sense approach because, again, we did not want to put ourselves on the defensive, saying you shall inform researchers that Professors X, Y and Z are also working in this area. We felt this is open market research. We will give help where we can. Usually it is received with gratitude, but we hate to say you must do this. We could let ourselves in for a lot of work and sometimes for no thanks for doing it. This is a very touchy area, and we did not try to pass on every conceivable thing that might come up.

I might say on the literary rights, which does not really concern this document, some libraries do not want to touch having the control of literary rights and being in the position of passing on who can and cannot use materials. If the library does not have them, it is strictly up to the scholar to get the permission where he can. This is another area that whichever way we went, it leads to a chain of other situations that have to be faced. That is why these are, hopefully, statements of general principles. I think you illustrated my point. You can still have the flexibility within your own universities to do as you wish on these matters.

MS. HOADLEY: On the question that Mr. Sparks was talking about, could not the statement that appears on this topic in the Society of American Archivists

standards for access be used in this statement [to the effect that] a repository should whenever possible, inform a researcher of parallel research by other individuals using the same paper and may supply names upon request. That does not make it mandatory; it makes it optional, and if you are going to go to these people and try to get them to agree to our statement anyway, why not go ahead and use the statement that they have adopted as part of this statement?

MR. FRANTZ: The committee did discuss this and felt that this is a common sense matter that we are all aware of and they just did not want to touch it. They felt that we could not really help very much in it, and we were afraid of putting pressure one way or the other. You are completely free to do this. This does not prohibit you in any way from informing a researcher of parallel research; by its absence, it does not say we have to do this. In other words, you should not read into these statements that since we did not mention this or that, this or that should not be done. That is not the intention of the statement.

MS. HOADLEY: I have another question: In number one, you have used the term "qualified researchers". Is that really necessary to say that? I do not want to make that as restrictive as you are saying. Are you going to set up librarians or archivists as judges as to who is a qualified person to use your material?

MR. FRANTZ: Some do. Some pass on the research itself or pass on the scholar's credentials and may deny access to the colleges.

MS. HOADLEY: Is that what libraries are all about?

MR. FRANTZ: I am not saying they should or they should not. This adopts the wording of ACRL: "qualified researchers on equal terms of access". What we added which is different is "unless prohibited by the regulations of the institution". But again, this statement does not one way or the other take sides; neither do most statements that I have seen (in fact I cannot remember one that does not say "qualified researchers"). It is absolutely meaningless, really, I do not know of any institution that really has standards at present to say what a "qualified researcher" is.

MS. HOADLEY: The American Archivists' statement does not use the phrase "qualified". I think that creates problems.

MR. FRANTZ: ACRL does and we will follow them on that.

MR. DE GENNARO: Thank you very much. If there are no further comments on this, all in favor of endorsing the Board's recommendation on the report of the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books, please indicate by saying "aye". [The vote was taken. The recommendation was approved].

There is another matter that this particular committee brought before the Board for discussion. It was the question of the gift of papers of

Hubert Humphry. Hubert Humphrey was denied a tax credit on the grounds that he had placed certain time restrictions on the use of these papers. There was a statement that the Committee sent to the Board for comments and possible approval, and the Board voted that it should make a revised text of that statement and then send it to the Internal Revenue Services and other appropriate agencies. I do not think that requires membership attention unless someone wants to pursue it further. Again, I want to thank Ray Frantz and his committee for an excellent job on these two statements. The members of the committee are William Bond from Harvard, William Cagle, John Finzi, James Henderson, Herman Kahn from Yale, and Ray Frantz is the Chairman.

* * * *

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee

[In the absence of Frederick Wagman, chairman of the Committee on the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, Philip McNiff read to the membership the report of the committee. This report appears as Appendix C of these Minutes].

* * * *

Task Force on a National Periodical Resources Plan

[The Report of the Task Force is included as Appendix D of these Minutes].

MR. HAMLIN: I will be very brief since I am on the program tomorrow. The Task Force has had several informal meetings. In a sense our work was done for us in the very fine report and study[1] that was done by Westat Inc. for the ARL. In very simplistic terms, the Task Force assignment seemed to be one of whether to approve or not to approve or, perhaps, to approve with reservation the recommendation of this study. So we prepared a rather extensive report and then we boiled it down to a page and a quarter, and I took the page and a quarter to the Board meeting yesterday and they boiled it down to a paragraph. That is where it stands now, and it is fine.

The Board took the stand that the thing to do right now is simply to endorse the proposal for a National Periodical Resources Center, without going into some other peripheral problems involved, such as fears of the book industry that this would cut into their business, or get into matters relating to the copyright problem.

MR. DE GENNARO: Arthur is right: the Board did boil this down; we felt that this was an issue that was very similar to the standards one: it is very hard to get agreement from boards and in meetings like this on a proposal as complex as this. We thought that the best thing to do would be to try to get

---

[1]Vernon Palmour and others, Access to Periodical Resources: a National Plan, Rockville, Md., Westat, Inc. for ARL, February 1974.

the Board to endorse the concept of a National Periodical Resources Center without getting into who should pay for it, where it should be and that kind of thing. And it was obvious from the discussions that the Board felt this is an important goal for ARL. Therefore, the Board made a recommendation, and I quote:

> The Association of Research Libraries recommends the immediate establishment and continued support by the federal government of a national periodical resources library as a practical, effective and vitally-needed aid to scholars and other research personnel in universities, business, industry and government.
>
> The proposed periodical library should provide, within relatively few days, journals published anywhere in the world which are needed for use in the advancement of knowledge or meeting the nation's pressing technical, economic and social problems. The ARL commends to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science the Westat report on a national periodical resources plan, and urges the National Commission to incorporate it into the national program for library and information services.

This was the recommendation that the Board approved and in turn, recommends to the membership for endorsement. And I would like to move that the membership endorse this recommendation of the Board.

MR. LORENZ: I think the word "immediate" in the first sentence might seem a little unreasonable, particularly since your recommendation is to the National Commission which plans to act with all considerable speed.

MR. HAMLIN: I think it belongs in there. I do not want to defend every word in the report, but remember when Donald Urquhart met with us after the IFLA meeting? Urquhart was the founder and amazingly successful operator of the British Library Lending Division, and his first words were: "You people have done enough studying and talking. It's time you got something on the road," and so I think "immediate" has a certain punch in there. We have been on this quite awhile and I would like to keep it in there.

MR. DE GENNARO: What I think is important here is that the Board and the Association go on record, if it feels this way, that it is in favor of the establishment of a National Periodical Resources Center, how ever you will want to define it, as soon as we can get it. I think this is an important thing because we have already been making overtures. We have actually been bringing pressures to bear on the National Commission to do this kind of thing; I felt a little bit uneasy about pushing the National Commission in this direction without having some endorsement by the Board and the membership. I kind of assumed that this was a legitimate ARL goal, but this is what I want to hear.

MR. SPARKS: A friendly amendment: I believe the National Commission now avoids the term "plan"; they use the term "program". Perhaps that language would please the Commission.

MR. DE GENNARO: Any other comments or discussions? If not, we are ready for the question on that. All in favor of the Board's recommendation, please indicate by saying "aye". [A vote was taken. The recommendation was approved].

* * * *

NCLIS National Program Documen

MR. DE GENNARO: Another item that the Board discussed was the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science program document ["A National Program for Library and Information Services"]. Some of us had the March 10, 1975 edition of the NCLIS program document; this has been considerably revised from the second edition which was distributed widely and read by many of you.

The March 10 edition, which was characterized as the "final edition", had a blue cover; it was kind of a limited edition for comments. The NCLIS staff naturally hopes that the ARL might want to endorse this document. We gave some critical comments on this edition, and there has been a new fourth chapter of that document that has been issued and apparently is going to go to press in a few weeks. The Board discussed this and it was obvious that there was nothing that the ARL could do with that report until it had heard from Alphonse Trezza, who is on the program tomorrow morning, and until we all could see the document in its final form. Accordingly the Board approved the following statement:

> Wishing to be supportive of the NCLIS in its projections, the Board resolved on motion of Edward Lathem, seconded by Richard Boss, to place before the ARL membership in October 1975, when a final text is available, the Commission's document charting a national program for library and information services, this with a view to securing the Association's endorsement thereof.

I am not submitting this for action. This is merely an information item and again, what it says is that when the final document is available, it will be distributed and we will vote one way or another on it at the October meeting.

* * * *

Criteria for Membership in ARL

MR. DE GENNARO: Other action that the Board took involved the question of membership criteria. Objective criteria were adopted two or three years ago with the stipulation that the Board would keep close watch and evaluate how they worked in practice. At least one criterion has been troublesome, and that is the one that stipulates that the number of Ph.Ds awarded must be equal

to 40 percent of the median for all ARL institutions. This particular criterion was questioned by a membership committee. There was a discussion that it might be dropped completely, but the membership voted to retain it. Now in view of the decreasing need for and production of Ph.Ds throughout the nation, the Board voted to reduce this criterion from 40 percent of the median to 30 percent of the median.

Consideration of this particular issue by the Board was precipitated by the fact that several libraries who exceeded the minimums in all other categories were slightly deficient in this category, so the Board felt that it had the responsibility to review this criteria, and made that change.

The Board also voted that a subcommittee of the Board be appointed to review all the membership criteria and report back to the Board by the May, 1976 meeting. The reason for the creation of this Board subcommittee was to review the other criteria that seemed to be potentially troublesome or changing in the light of the changing times. It is not the Board's intention to undertake a thorough review of the whole concept of quantitative criteria.

MR. O'KEEFFE: Who is in charge of that subcommittee of the Board; who might be contacted?

MR. DE GENNARO: It has not yet been decided; I thought we would do that tomorrow afternoon at our Board meeting, but I think if you have any comments or suggestions, send them on either to John McDonald or myself, and we will see to it that it gets to the proper person.

MS. WHITNEY: I think it would be useful if we ask the membership to endorse the Board's suggestion on the 30 percent.

MR. DE GENNARO: I would like to move that the membership endorse the Board's action in approving a reduction of the percentage of Ph.Ds from 40 percent to 30 percent of the median. [A vote was taken. The Board action was approved].

* * * *

ARL Membership in the Center for Research Libraries

MR. DE GENNARO: The last thing I want to report is that the Board also voted to join the Center for Research Libraries. The annual dues are $100. The Center has just opened up its membership to organizations such as the ARL, and I think it would be a good idea if we joined so that we could attend their meetings, receive their publications, have an influence in the government of the organization, and in general support the Center for Research Libraries.

* * * *

Report of the Executive Director

MR. McDONALD: I want to comment on some of the events of my first four months or so at the ARL office, to bring you up to date on some of the happenings there and to share with you some observations on this meeting. My first comment is to commend you for what I think has been a very fruitful business meeting. I think you took some very significant actions, and I commend the membership and also the Board for bringing to you, I think, some very important resolutions.

I want also to enter a comment at this time with respect to the work that Robert Downs has done on the Standards Committee report. He was kind enough to thank the rest of us who served on this committee, but I think the other members of the committee would agree with me that Mr. Downs really did the job pretty much by himself. Once in awhile we sent him comments, but if credit is due, it is due to the Chairman. Thank you again, Bob.

I would like to ask you whether my impression is correct about last night's orientation meeting,[1] if that is the right word for it. Signals I get is that most people found the meeting useful and think that it or something like it might be tried again. I do not want to anticipate what the questionnaire might tell us. Certainly, we do want to hear what you have to say via that questionnaire. Those of you who have not turned them in may do so to me or to Suzanne Frankie and we will find a way to compile the results. The recorders will be sharing with the Board tomorrow at its meeting the comments that they gathered, and perhaps we can send along to you the results of the assessment through the ARL Newsletter, a copy of which should be coming to you fairly shortly after this meeting.

Let me now go on to talk a little bit about our financial situation. I shared with the Board a first quarter report which I think shows us to be not only solvent, but in most categories closely approximating our budget projections. We have had a significant increase in the membership over the last few years with the addition of some ten libraries. On the other hand, we have had increasing financial obligations, so that we are able to maintain a satisfactory balance in the treasury. We have talked in the ARL office for quite a period of time now about the need for additional staff, and I think that I see the desirability of our really taking that step fairly soon, but I do not think that this implies any immediate change in the membership assessment. Unless there are questions of a more specific nature, that is really all I mean to say about the financing of the ARL office. As you know, we make a fuller report at our next meeting.

I would like, however, to share with you once again news about the financing of our two project offices. The Center for Chinese Research Materials has received a grant of $300,000 for a three-year period from the Mellon Foundation. Our gratitude goes not only to the Foundation, but to the Center Advisory Committee and Funding Committee which helped us to secure this award. We are very pleased to have this support. It does not entirely meet the needs of the Center, but it comes a long way towards doing so. In

---

[1] See Appendix E of these minutes for a report of this meeting.

addition to the Mellon funding which begins in the Fall at the time that the NEH and Ford Foundation funding ends, we are anticipating funding from the State Department. This is not certain, and the amount of it is not now known, but it does appear that the State Department will at least for one year and perhaps longer, support four cooperative activities, one of which is our Center. And if it comes to pass, I expect it to make up the shortfall in the Center's budget.

As far as the Office of University Library Management Studies is concerned, Duane Webster has already shared with us the good news that the Council on Library Resources has continued its funding of the Management Office, in this case for a three-year period which, in itself, is unusual. We all recognize our debt to the Council for its strong support of the Management Office. We feel that the good work of the Office has repaid the investment and earned the confidence of the Council. I would remind the membership that in addition to the funding from the Council, you have authorized the ARL to devote an increasing amount to the support of the Management Office, so that over the period of time that the $210,000 is being provided by the Council, the ARL itself will be providing $90,000.

Let me go on now to talk about one activity which has consumed a great deal of my time and which has consumed a fair amount of the Association's funds. I refer to copyright and our efforts to represent the position of the Association, and I think of libraries generally, with respect to library photocopying and the copyright revision bill.

If you read the ARL Newsletter account of the Williams and Wilkins decision which I wrote and sent to all of you, I think you will find it at some variance with the newspaper and journal accounts of that decision. There has been, I think, a conscious attempt on the part of some to represent the Supreme Court's action as a nondecision, as a "cop-out", as a failure to speak up. But from a legal point of view, as our attorneys are fond of pointing out, it is a very significant decision in that it affirms the holding of the lower Court of Claims, and therefore sets the law of the land in this area. So we do have a victory, if there are any victories in this area; as we heard in the morning program, we are all in this together. But there are unresolved matters. From the point of view of further negotiations, I think we have to say that the Williams and Wilkins decision is in our favor.

Meanwhile, we have been participating in the copyright conference that was convened by the Registrar of Copyrights and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Barbara Ringer and Frederick Burkhardt have taken an objective stance, but have called together representatives of the two sides in a series of meetings. The full group elected to have a working committee meet more frequently and to report back to the present group. I have been serving as a member of the working committee. Stephen McCarthy continues to serve the Association as our consultant on copyright, and has been participating in the work of the working committee. On occasion,

Philip Brown, our attorney, joins with us. These meetings take quite a lot of time; we are hopeful that the investment of time and money will lead to good results, but I would not want to promise any early resolution of the copyright problem. I think that the two sides are still some distance apart. I think sometimes the publicity that comes out of these meetings suggests that great progress has been made and that a breakthrough is eminent. I do not want to be negative about this. I think there is a great deal more understanding on each side of the other's point of view than there was, but I think we still have reserved the right to disagree, and ultimately we may find that we have to continue to do so.

This leads me to say that what one does in a session which is intended to try to work out differences is not the same as what one does when one represents his position before the Congress in legislative hearings. So that while we talk with our friends from the publishing community and working group, we prepare testimony which represents our traditional view to share with the appropriate legislative committees.

Next week when we return to Washington, we will have an opportunity to present testimony to the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice, which Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee is chaired by Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin. The Subcommittee has decided to hold a series of hearings, the first of which were held this week, and John Lorenz tells me that he presented testimony on behalf of the Library of Congress yesterday. Barbara Ringer, speaking for the Copyright Office has also presented testimony. The hearings of the 7th and 8th of May are for government witnesses. Next week on May 14 the Subcommittee will hear from representatives of publishers and of libraries. The format for the hearing is this: each side has a half hour to present oral testimony, after which each side will be questioned by the Subcommittee for a half hour. The interested library organizations, in view of the very limited time available, decided to try to join their testimony and to elect one spokesman for all of our interests. In addition to the ARL the interested library organizations are the American Library Association, the Medical Library Association, and the Music Library Association. We have also heard from other groups around the country and to the extent possible are accommodating their suggestions as well.

We have, with the help of James Sharaf, attorney for Harvard University, produced the draft of this testimony, and our initial hope was to be able to recruit one of our own members, William Dix, to present the testimony on our behalf. I think Mr. Dix will not mind if I mention that fact, but he has an unshakeable commitment elsewhere and could not do it. But we all feel comfortable with the alternate that we have selected, Edmon Low, who is the Chairman of the Copyright Subcommittee of the ALA Legislation Committee. He is a thoroughly experienced person in the copyright area and one who has a long history of successful testimony before Congressional committees. Mr. Low will be accompanied at the hearing by a panel of representatives of library associations who will backstop him in the question period. We hope by this format to have the best of two worlds: solid integrated testimony from one

person and a variety of approaches from others. The publishers, of course, will have their own strategy for representing their own points of view.

And while we mean to have a number of recommendations with respect to the copyright revision bill and to represent a number of attitudes toward the whole bill, one of our major interests is in Section 108(g)(2), which refers to systematic reproduction. We mean to have something to say on that subject and each of the other associations is fully in agreement with us on that. I will not take time to go into detail about that, but if members are interested in knowing more about it, I would be glad to talk with them later.

Another important development in the copyright area is the likely establishment of another national commission, the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works. Somebody, maybe Barbara Ringer, has properly dubbed this CONTU which is manageable. CONTU would be administered through the Library of Congress, if it comes into being. The Library has sought funds for the Commission in the amount of $337,000. If those funds are forthcoming, the Commission will get into business. The appointments will be managed by the White House and candidates have been suggested by various parties. I think it is correct that the Library of Congress has secured consultant services to do some preliminary work in anticipation of the creation of CONTU. A very able, personable young attorney, Arthur Levine, is working on that for the Library of Congress.

I think that is enough of the copyright issue. I would only say further that the involvement of a prestigious and able law firm such as Cox, Langford and Brown that serves the ARL is an expensive matter, and I do not think we can continue to invest as much in the copyright issue as we have been doing over the last few months. I am hopeful that after the hearings we can reduce the rate of our effort and also the rate of our payments to our attorneys.

I would like to turn now for a moment to a subject that has also occupied your executive staff very heavily. This is a proposal which we have been drafting and revising for submission to the National Science Foundation, Office of Science Information Service. We are calling this the Interlibrary Communication Project and I am glad to say that on the eve of our departure for this meeting, we were able to send copies of our report to Edward Weiss at NSF. How promptly NSF is able to deal with the proposal, we are not sure, but they are anxious to move forward with it and I am sure they will give it their prompt attention. They have been most cooperative with us in the development of the proposal and we appreciate their help.

The proposal builds upon a considerable body of work that has preceeded it. A number of studies have been underwritten by OSIS and managed by the ARL. I will not review those for you now, but the study we are now concerned with is a successor to the SILC study done by Becker and Hayes and released in February of last year.[1] The thrust of the present proposal is to investi-

---

[1]Robert M. Hayes. A System for Interlibrary Communication (SILC). Los Angeles, California, Becker & Hayes for ARL, 1974.

gate through a research project intersystem communications in the interlibrary loan area through the use of existing networks and with the cooperation of the Library of Congress as the principal investigator. The ARL would be the project director, the financial manager and ultimately responsible for the final report to go into NSF. The project participants are two networks in the East and two in the West: in the West, Stanford BALLOTS and the Washington Library Network; in the East, NELINET and NYSIL. The role of the Library of Congress is important in the proposal in that they would coordinate the work of the network participants.

The proposal has been shared with the Board, and a number of members of the Association have been active in its development, notably the Interlibrary Loan Committee chaired by David Weber, as well as other members of the Association who have been called upon to review the proposal at various stages. We have also been fortunate to have the advice of some outside reviewers. I would like particularly to thank Lawrence Livingston, Council on Library Resources, James Riley of the Federal Library Committee who could not be with us today, and Alphonse Trezza of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I do not mean to imply that these people are responsible in any way for the content of the proposal, but they were generous with their time and advice with respect to it, and I think we faithfully tried to follow the advice they gave us as we revised the proposal. It is kind of a standing joke around the office that we are now working on the 75th edition of Operation SILC, as we call it, and I am glad to say that we have finished that work.

We sent to all the ARL directors a copy of the ACE International Education Project Task Force Report [on Library & Information Resources]. I simply want to say that that is the work of a task force chaired by John Berthel, and it represents one of a series of task force reports that will be coordinated by the International Education Project being conducted by the American Council on Education. This is an attempt to secure funding for international studies (what we used to call area studies), but which has been broadened in scope and direction. There is an International Education Act on the books but it has never been funded, and this project is an attempt to awaken the interest of the Congress in funding that. The NDEA programs under Title VI are in a related area, and they too are suffering funding difficulties. So the ACE International Education Project is something in which we are interested and in which we are participating, and which we hope will result in funding for the support of international education, and as an aspect of that, of libraries serving international education.

You have heard reports from some of our commissions, from a number of our committees and a very thorough summary by Mr. De Gennaro of the Board of Directors meetings, so I will not go into that. I would like to mention one other funding situation and that is future funding for library programs. As you know, the question is soon to arise whether we should argue to continue the kinds of programs we have had under the Higher Education Act Title II-A and B, or whether we try to support new legislation in the library area. We have continued to feel that a one-year extension of the present programs would be the easiest way to go. There does not seem to be very much incli-

nation in the Congress to provide additional funds for programs or to do anything very innovative this year. If we could secure the continuation of the present programs, that would be about as much as we could hope to achieve. However, Title II-B has already been zeroed in the House Appropriations Committee, and an effort will need to be made to try to restore those funds in the Senate. You will be hearing from us and have heard from us, as a matter of fact, in support of an urgent plea that the ALA Washington Office has sent to all libraries.

In this connection I might note now that the Association of American Universities has a legislation committee which is seeking the advice of librarians in its legislative campaign, and quite a number of you who represent AAU libraries have been approached to serve them in an advisory capacity. I have here the list of persons who have been so approached and I would like you to know who they are: Charles Churchwell of Brown; James Jones of Case Western Reserve; Benjamin Powell of Duke; David Stamm of Johns Hopkins; Eugene Kennedy of NYU, who is Chairman of our own Federal Relations Committee; John McGowan, Northwestern; Richard De Gennaro, Pennsylvania; David Weber of Stanford. There are a few other persons on the committee representing library schools and other institutions.

The Board discussed briefly plans for the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services. The Conference has not yet secured funding. The authorized legislation permits $3.5 million for the effort, and if the appropriation is made, a series of state and regional meetings would precede the national conference. The planning and administration of the White House Conference, if it is funded, would be the responsibility of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. We are, in other words, in a posture of watchful waiting, and we will try to keep you informed through the ARL Newsletter of developments there.

This leads me into my penultimate point here: namely, that we are trying to keep in touch with the work of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Alphonse Trezza and I and Frederick Burkhardt, when he is in town, let each know what the other is doing, and I hope this friendly exchange can continue.

Let me now just conclude by saying that it has been an extremely interesting, and very busy and demanding several months since I succeeded Stephen McCarthy. I am not sure how I feel about it. I truly have enjoyed it, but it is a tough job. And I think Suzanne Frankie would agree with me, we have had an extremely busy spring. I think from what I have told you before, you can see that several things coincide over this period to make it, I think, an unusually busy time -- but maybe it is always like that. We are just going to have to learn to live with it. As I was talking with Margaret Child yesterday, she was trying to tell me that living in Washington is always like that. She too, is in a position where a large amount of work descends on a very small staff. I certainly do not want to appear to be complaining. I think though, that this has implications for the management of our work.

I have told the Board this story. We will continue to keep the Board informed, and we will take appropriate measures if things get unbearable.

To conclude, I simply want to express my appreciation to all the staff who have been extremely supportive, and in particular to Suzanne Frankie who does an amazing number of things well. Thank you very much.

* * * *

Report of the ARL President

MR. DE GENNARO: My own report can be fairly brief because you heard much of it at the business meeting. Thanks to you all we did accomplish quite a number of important things, but I do want to mention a few others. Because of the change in the meeting date from January to October this year, I am going to have the distinction of being the first ARL president to serve a nine-month term, from January to October. Some people, including myself, thought this was a good piece of luck for the Association, but actually it does not matter much because the full year's activity seems to be compressed into these nine months. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that I have already served a full term, if I measured it by the time and energy that I have devoted to ARL concerns since January.

When I was elected president last year, I looked around for a guiding theme for my term and a few useful projects on which to focus my efforts. The theme I selected was national trends, ARL's influence on them and their influence on ARL. As you can see, the theme has been reflected in the programs for which I have been responsible. I have tried to use the vehicle of the programs to call attention to some of the more important developments in the field. In January you will recall we had a program on the future of the card catalog, which was apparently timely and so well received that we published it under separate cover and it is now being sold. This morning's program focused on the whole broad area of relations between publishers, scholars and librarians regarding scholarly communications. The intent here was to alert the membership to this problem area and to open the dialogue with certain groups. As many of you know, I wrote an article on one aspect on this subject for Library Journal on pay libraries and user charges and that sort of thing.

In addition to that, the other big thing that I have been pushing is the concept of national resource sharing. We have worked hard to create a climate to foster this idea and to get the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to marry the NPRC report with the Westat resources and bibliographic systems report. In addition, I have also written an article on this which will be published in Library Journal in the next issue. The attempt here was to call attention to this concept and to push it along a little bit.

Also on the national scene you have heard John McDonald talking about copyright. I have not been involved in that. That is something that is extremely complex and requires a kind of competence and continuity that John can bring to it, so I have left that part of the activity to him completely.

We have also been involved with the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. ARL has had an input, both through a meeting in March at the L'Enfant Plaza in Washington, and through letters, telephone conversations and various kinds of backroom politicking with the officers of NCLIS. And you will see that the program tomorrow with Alphonse Trezza is geared in that direction, as is the second part of the morning which points up again the importance of the Federal Relations Committee chaired by Eugene Kennedy and a number of new members; they are meeting here for the first time, and they will get active.

In addition I have accepted an appointment to the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee for the White House Conference, so ARL, through me, will have some input to that. It has not met yet, and there is no information about it so I will not say any more. I will give a more complete report at the October meeting.

I would like to conclude by thanking John McDonald and Suzanne Frankie and the staff for all their help. I was tremendously impressed at my table last night with the discussion groups that there were several members sitting around there who were quite astonished to learn that the ARL office consisted of only two professionals. I took that as a tribute to the amount of productive work that those two professionals turn out.

Now to conclude I have one last item; I think you should carry away from this meeting something that I picked up from Frederick Kilgore. He was travelling in Europe the last couple of weeks spreading the word over there about OCLC, and he passed through UNESCO and picked up a message from the bulletin board there that I would like to pass on to you. It was the six stages of a project, and since all of you have been involved in projects and will be involved in projects, I thought you ought to learn this at this meeting. The first stage is elation and exuberance; the second stage is confusion; the third stage is disaster; the fourth stage is search for the guilty; the fifth stage is punishment of the innocent; the sixth stage is distinction for the uninvolved. And with that, I think I will bring this meeting to an end.

* * * *

A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Introduction

MR. DE GENNARO: This is a critical time in national planning for libraries. We have reached a point where the NCLIS statement on the broad national program for libraries is pretty much complete. It has gone through numerous revisions. I have read the various versions of it, and while there are still some things in it that we might wish to change, I think that it is a remarkably complete and well-balanced document, particularly if one thinks of all the various constituencies that have to be satisfied with such a document.

Unfortunately it has not yet been published in its final form, and although Alphonse Trezza and I would have liked to ask ARL to be the first library organization to endorse it in principle, I felt I could not ask an organization to endorse a document that they had not read in final form. As I told you in the business meeting yesterday, the ARL was very supportive of the NCLIS document, and the matter of endorsing it in principle will be brought up before you in October. I would like to read the resolution again that the Board passed to emphasize our support for it.

> Wishing to be supportive of the NCLIS in its projections, the Board resolved on motion of Edward Lathem, seconded by Richard Boss, to place before the ARL membership in October 1975, when a final text is available, the Commission's document charting a national program for library and information services, this with a view to securing the Association's endorsement thereof.

I would like to say that I am going to ask the Association at the October meeting to endorse it in principle and with a certain kind of enthusiasm, because I think that we will have by that time when you see it, a document which does constitute the basis for a national plan. I think there is nothing to be gained at that point for nit-picking with the details of it. I think the important thing after that is the implementation and just getting it going and going forward with it.

To turn now to our speakers for this morning's program, I do not think Alphonse Trezza really needs a long introduction. He spoke to us at the last meeting and I think you all know him. Just briefly, Mr. Trezza is the Executive Director of NCLIS. As of Monday, he is the real Executive Director; he has burned all his bridges behind him. As you all know, he was the Illinois State Librarian; he was the Executive Director of the Catholic Library Association. He is really an academic librarian; he worked at the University of Pennsylvania Library for six years, and his reputation and fame is still there at Pennsylvania. We still talk about Alphonse Trezza and his regime at the time. Without further introduction I will call on Alphonse Trezza to make his presentation.

* * * *

MR. TREZZA: I am pleased to be here. My purpose today is two-fold: one is to try to make sure you have some understanding of what the National Commission is and is trying to do, and secondly, and most importantly, what it means to you. The National Commission without question has probably solicited at this time more opinions from the profession at large than any organization has ever done. The Commission, in developing its program over the last three years, has literally stumped the country with regional hearings, seminars, you name it. We have met with every group we can think of. We have had people testify in Washington, Chicago, San Antonio, Denver, the West Coast, all over the place. And if you have not had your input, it is your fault.

The summary [of the National Program statement] was published two years ago. First of all the original draft was published and, as you well know, received lots of comments -- in fact, over a thousand letters, comments, etc. It was really amazing. That resulted in the preparation of a second draft which had a lot of unanimity behind it. We still got some comments. The one weakness with the second draft, as you are all well aware, was the fact that by the time we put the second draft to bed, it was clear that a section, chapter, page, something on the information industry was necessary. I think it was kind of unfortunate looking back to put a blank page in, because what it did was raise some expectations in both directions: fears on the one hand and overexpectations on the other. So no matter what we put out in that chapter, it was bound to get an almost violent reaction.

The Commission in its meeting last September in Denver decided, partly through my urgings and partly because they desired it, that the time for writing was rapidly coming to an end, and the time for action was here. We decided there would be only one more draft and that was going to be it, and then we were going to adopt it and try to move toward the real goal which is implementation. We could spend the rest of our lives doing drafts. Now that is the technique they use in Washington when they do not want to do anything. They send it back for revision; put it back in the committee again. Well, the Commission cannot exist that way. The Commission must have the reputation of getting things done, otherwise it is just another Washington bureaucratic organization which serves no purpose for the Administration, the Congress or the profession.

Consequently, the Commission set a fairly tight schedule. Do you remember when we published it we called it a "Time Line". We published the "Time Line", and along with it we also issued a resolution of our support for library legislation for this current year. As you will recall, the Commission took a stand on the continuation and extension of LSCA, of ESEA, of HEA, which is the first time we fully took a public stand on that.

So we took a dramatic action. We worked on the third draft. We set a deadline and on that deadline we stopped receiving input. As I am sure most of you know, the one Commissioner who has the responsibility to try to do the actual writing along with the staff is Joseph Becker. Obviously, you can not get the whole committee to write. So Joseph Becker is the one that tries these things out, then we all tear it apart. So he and I then tried to put together draft number three, and we spent five full days going through that

document, page by page, with every piece of paper that we received from anybody. We had over 200 comments of different kinds. I would say about 25 or 30 were what I would call long, thoughtful reactions to the various parts of the document, and we struggled and revised the document. We still ended the week without a Chapter 4 because no one would suggest language for Chapter 4. The information industry would not do it; the publishers would not do it: no one would. So no matter what you think or what you have heard, that Chapter 4 was not written by Mr. Zurkowski of the Information Industry Association, even though some people say it sounds like it. Maybe it sounds like it, but he did not write it. In other words, we finished it and we got Chapter 4, knowing that it would raise some interesting reaction.

And do you know what else did it? What really did it I think, was the fact that on the blue cover, it said "Final Draft" and my cover letter said, "You have until April 24 to respond" -- three weeks. In other words, now the fat was in the fire, and now the response was loud.

It is interesting because the publishers objected to Chapter 4 as much as some of the academic libraries did. Some of our Commissioners reacted negatively to Chapter 4 -- in fact, so much so that they actually read the whole document carefully, and I got comments on parts of the document that we had been kicking around for a year. There were many, many people who never before had reacted to any part of it. Now all of a sudden they reacted to any part of it. So that was a very positive and useful response. Chapter 4 well served its real purpose. What it did is it pointed out to everybody that we really had a mixed and complex constituency. The National Commission's responsibility, after all, is not just for libraries -- not that libraries are not basic, but it is broader than that. We have to keep reminding ourselves that we are responsible, for example, to libraries that are involved in ARL, ALA, SLA, and right on down the line. We are concerned with the worries and problems of publishers, the information industry, who are distributors of information services, for all the people in educational technology, the broad spectrum. Obviously then, to get a document which somehow will address itself to all of these interests is not easy.

One of the criticisms or comments you may have read in "Hot Line" said something to the effect that the document was redundant, repetitive, and needed a good high school English teacher to go over it. And my response to the editor was, "You bet it's repetitive and it's redundant, and it's going to stay that way. It's a consensus document. It's not a King James version." It is a consensus document, and do you know why it is repetitive? Because when we did not do the repeating, we were accused of giving more weight to something else.

Now what you have to keep in mind is that you represent the intellectual elite. This group represents the "haves," and other people in the profession are saying here we go again: the Commission is going to spring for the national program which is to serve the rich at the expense of the poor -- the same argument you hear regarding the economy. In other words, here we are worrying about those who already have access to tremendous intellectual

resources, and we are going to put a tremendously big program in to make it easier for them at the expense of the urban person, the minority, the poor, the person who is struggling for an education. That is an accusation, no matter whether you agree with it or not. It is an issue we have to confront. So to try to reach the wide constituency, we have to make sure that we somehow address, for example, the public librarian's claim that this is heavily weighted to the special library, etc.

One of the information industry said to me, "It's a beautiful library lobbying piece." The Social Responsibilities Roundtable said, "You hardly scratched the surface." The Intellectual Freedom Roundtable says, "You still have not addressed the real issues." You say, and everybody says, "What are your priorities? How come you didn't list all of your things in priority order?" "What's the cost?" say OMB. "You have not run the cost. Where is the draft legislation," and they go on and on, and the answer is simple. The answer is all of that. The first part explains why the document is a consensus document, and as such, does repeat and re-emphasize. And the other part of those questions I just posed are what I call implementation. You got these two issues.

If you read the May issue of Wilson Library Bulletin, you will find that Mr. Eschelman has taken a fairly supportive view of the document, which is interesting and I am pleased obviously. I just want to read you one little thing Mr. Eschelman says:

> There is no doubt that the third draft ... is vastly more representative of the whole information community than the first one. And the document summarizes its entire program in two major objectives: 1) to strengthen, develop or create, where needed, human and material resources which are supportive of high quality library and information services; and 2) to join together the library and information facilities in the country, through a common pattern of organization, uniform standards, shared communications, to form a nationwide network. If these are in priority order, and so implemented the document may prove to be worthy of full support.

So even some of our critics are saying now that the document has moved a long way.

Now, what does that mean to you as a research library, because after all, you still have to look at that document and say, "What's my role? What does that do for me in the national program?" Let us just concentrate for a few minutes on what it does for large research libraries. First of all, the document suggests that we have to do a better job in sharing resources. It suggests we are going to have to share resources on a regional and national basis. It does not suggest how. Remember the document is not an implementation document; it is a long-range program. It is a program of goals or assumptions, as we are calling them, and objectives; it is interesting to remember that none of the five assumptions or the eight objectives have changed

from the second to the third draft. No one has challenged those assumptions or goals. What is being discussed and challenged are the words, the innuendoes, the specific language.

That is why in my cover letter I said to everybody that saw the final draft that we were not asking you to support the document word for word, line for line, sentence for sentence, paragraph for paragraph, page for page. Not even I could do that. What we are asking is are you willing as individuals first, to support the National Commission's program in concept and principle? That is basic. You and I as individuals first have to do that. If we can do that, then we can go the next step. You say okay, I buy it as an individual. Now, what about me as head of my institution? Can I now look at it again and say yes, I can also endorse this because it will help my institution; it will mean that in the long run at least I am going to be better off than not having it. Your third consideration of course, is what about you as a member of an organization, be it ARL, ALA, SLA or whatever organization you are in? Can you endorse it in that capacity? And, of course, finally, can you endorse it as a member of the total library community? It seems to me you have got to think in those terms, and you have to come to your own conclusion at the appropriate time.

As Mr. De Gennaro pointed out, hopefully ARL will take some official action come next fall. SLA may take some action at least react in June, and ALA also in June. So we hope to have some reaction then from at least the major organizations.

It is clear that the competition for money today is worse than it has ever been. If we do not really develop more effective sharing, we are all going to suffer for it. You cannot live in isolation, no matter how good your college is today. I am not going to say which state, because I do not want to embarrass anybody, but I came in a meeting and I was shocked to hear that in one state, a whole group of state colleges have had their book budgets cut to zero for two full years. These colleges have not bought a single new book in two years. That is almost inconceivable; I just could not believe what I heard. So i reacted emotionally. I said, "You mean you all sat on your hands and let it happen? Where is the march on the capitol? Why didn't all the other academic libraries and public libraries and special libraries come to the rescue and pound and demand and say that's absolutely irresponsible. To cut it is one thing, but to cut it to zero? How do you operate an academic institution without a new book for two years? Inconceivable."

But the fact is that is an economic problem, isn't it? We failed in that case. Our problem is the political process; if we do not learn to use it, we will always get just the crumbs. Now, we have had some successes, but we have had them in the good years. I maintain from personal experience in Illinois, that there never is a good year, that there never is a bad year. They are all the same. When you go down to your capitol, you are still a -ow priority, because they still look at basic funds, "departmental," as they call it, such as fire and that sore of thing -- the basic necessities of

life, as opposed to the intellectual necessities of life as we see it.

We still have a constant battle, but I maintain that no matter how tight the economy, we have a right to our share of that money, and we are not getting it, and we are never going to get it if we do not get together, if we do not have a national program which we can sell as a long-range plan which shows how we are going to increase the use and effectiveness of our resources.

We all talk about coordinated or cooperative acquisitions. I do not know of one such program in this country that is truly cooperative. But we talk about it. So the problem with all of this networking and cooperation we keep talking about is that somebody has to give, and that means everybody. You cannot go into these things and say, "What are we going to get out of it?" I suspect in 90 percent of the cases, the answer is going to be "Nothing." If we go into it and say, "What can I give? What can I do?" and we all did it, we obviously all would receive. It is a fairly basic principle.

The responsibility for funding all this is at three levels: it is at the local level; it is at the state level; it is at the federal level. The local level would be in your case your local university. It is a mix of funding. It is called "balanced intergovernmental funding" as opposed to partnership. "Balanced intergovernmental funding", that is our goal. Now, how do we get a balance? We had a report on public libraries which suggests that the balance should be 50 percent state, 20 percent federal and 30 percent local. We are nowhere near it, but that is the goal. The report says at the moment we are about 67 percent federal; about four or five percent in most states (maybe eight or nine percent in some states); and the balance, local. So right now, the local is about 85 percent in round figures; in academic levels it is even higher.

Therefore we have got to make sure that when we do networking effectively, your institution first must get support and a reasonable level of standards for your own institution. That is an organization.

Secondly, however, within that state you are part of that state's interchange, that state's network, that state's cooperative program, and therefore, you have a right, a responsibility to see to it that you participate in the state's funding to the extent that you are providing the services. And finally, of course, as you go out of your state, you qualify in the federal funding.

The report talks about protocols, about standards, about interfacing, about using computers. The important thing is to think of it organizationally now, instead of thinking about what I call the technical parts of it. Regarding organization, what we are saying is you build like a pyramid; you have your local at the bottom; you have your state; and in some parts of the country, you have regionals; and then the national. Now, you do not need a regional in every part of the country. We do not have to all suddenly go out and form two new regionals because it just so happens they do not have one in the Middle West and one in the Middle Atlantic states. My answer to that is, so what? There is no magic in regionals. If the need is there, let it so be; if there is not, let us not manufacture another level of bureaucracy. We do not need it. That

means you have to have another staff, spend some more money, not for producing more programs, but for producing another level of bureaucracy. I am not convinced that you need it, but if you do need it, fine. But do not do it because they have one out in the West and they have one in New England.

You have got your pyramid, and what you have to do is develop regional mechanisms to make this thing work. Naturally we have to identify basic national collections, and therefore we need some funding support in the federal government. For example, we say very firmly in the final draft of the report that the Library of Congress not only is, in fact, acting as a national library but should definitely be the national library. Without saying it ought to be, we say it should be, definitely. Now, we have to achieve it. We are saying that the National Libraries of Medicine and Agriculture are an important part of the total program and must continue to have their funding at good levels in order to produce the programs.

We are not saying that we are going to create a national network and say, do away with the N[illegible] regional network. Neither are we saying that it necessarily remains the way it is. Obviously, we hope it will be better, no matter how good it is. So the report, in other words, is not saying "Let's limit what we have got;" neither is it saying, "Let's keep what we have got." All it is saying is, "Let's examine everything that we have and let's form a national network which interfaces organizationally, technically, and more important, attitudinally. You know, the success of this program is much more based on our attitude than it is any of the words.

If you will, drop your fears. Roosevelt said it, and everybody repeated the sentence, and I could not repeat it enough. Most of the fears I have come in contact with within my own state, Illinois, in developing our network, were based on fear for fear itself, and none of them have ever been realized. Have faith. Take a chance. Dare to be different. Dare to stop worrying about your own institution and think of the other person for a change. I know some of you are on the "have" ends and you are giving constantly, but instead of stopping giving, demand that that giving be properly recognized and supported at the appropriate levels. That is what you should fight for, not to cut it off. That is an attitude again.

What you are saying is what I am doing is right, but if you keep taking away, we are going to wither and die because we cannot exist if you are constantly pulling out everything we have got. So you have got to make sure that we can continue to serve you by giving us the support we deserve because we are doing a job. As you can see, it is an attitude again, instead of saying, "okay, we are going to set a fee and that's it." It is like a wall. Should we decide on the level of fees and say that it is only a certain service level that people can expect for a tax -- remember none of the service is free. Are we going to define the level and say no one can expect service beyond this level, except if they pay for it? That is certainly a possibility, but most of us are saying at this point that that is not what we are really after. We are really after a continuation of the maximum possible library services to serve the people of this country when they need it, without questions about

why they need it, because that is their business. And we have to make sure we know where the material is, how to deliver it, how to identify it, how to improve that so that we spend our money not on mechanisms, but on services, and we use mechanisms and computers as our servants and not our masters, that we use an organization again, not to freeze us into a pattern, but to make it effective and flexible enough so we can change it. That is the challenge.

The Commission will do its best once a program is out to work towards implementation. The plan is like this: on Friday or Monday morning the program document will be delivered to the Government Printing Office. If all goes well and the schedules are all met, sometime towards the end of June, the published report will be available and will be distributed widely. We will then move from phase one, which is the writing, to phase two, which is implementation. You will notice the paragraph in the preface which says this is a long-range planning document. It is a dynamic document which will undergo constant scrutiny and change. The Commission envisions that within two years a revised edition will come out. We welcome your suggestions and constructive criticisms. In other words, it is not something etched in glass or stone or bronze, whatever you like. It is the beginning and not the end. It is the beginning of implementation of a national program, and not the end of putting in writing what we think we believe. At this moment, we think it represents our best thinking and our best efforts. And two years from now, it may be quite different.

* * * *

Reactors

MR. HOPP: Let me simply state that my reaction to the report is going to be a personal one primarily from the vantage point of a state-supported mid-western university. I realize that it is quite easy to get caught up in the evangelistic rhetoric that we just heard, which Mr. Trezza is capable of doing, of course, very well. And my remarks for that reason may border on what may be interpreted as nit-picking, although I do not intend it for that. I think that what I want to do is to share some concerns on behalf of a research library, and for the record. I think it would be too bad, given this opportunity to comment on the report, if we did not express at least a point of view from a research library.

I want to preface my remarks by saying that at the end of what I am about to say I do indicate that I support the document, whereas during my remarks it may seem to the contrary.

The general framework of the national program is built on five major assumptions, at least one of which speaks to the library and information resources as national resources which should be developed, strengthened, organized and made available in the public interest. The program also has what is referred to as two major program objectives, the first of which is "to strengthen, develop, or create where needed, human and material resources..."

And then there are stated in the recommended national program eight program objectives. I want particularly to focus on one great omission in these objectives which appears in the recommended program, and I stress "recommended program" because at least in some instances I think people will turn to the program and read that, and will not necessarily refer to the introductory supporting statements that lead up to the program. And I think for that reason that I want to focus on the recommended program itself.

A network will be no stronger than the resource libraries that support it. We can create a network and have a good communication system, but unless there are information materials in the network, the services cannot be performed, which is a roundabout way of saying that the strength of any national program is going to be the major academic and public research libraries of this country. For this reason, it is surprising that the National Commission states in one of its eight basic objectives the following, and I am quoting here:

> The private sector (and I think they are primarily talking about the Information Industry here) has thus far received little assistance from the federal government to help strengthen its ability to serve more people ... It is essential that they be incorporated in the National Program.

Yet nowhere in the eight basic objectives is there a similar statement of the need to support the major research libraries which truly are national resources, and are ipso facto going to be the backbone of any national program. I would like to give you a local example.

In Minnesota, we have a statewide network which is call MINITEX, and any citizen can enter the state network by going to his local public library and thereby get the information he needs. Of the information requests that enter the system, over 80 percent of them are met from the resources of the University of Minnesota Library. Of course, the network depends upon the teletype system, its photocopied materials, and its Bell Telephone lines, and many other elements that make up the total, but without the University of Minnesota Library, at least the Minnesota network would be largely ineffective.

I am concerned therefore that the National Commission in outlining its national program, fails to give recognition to the need for the federal government to assist in the sustenance of the research libraries of this country. I find this, I think, one of the most disturbing things about the Commission's report. In objective six the report states, that the federal government should help strengthen the private sector's ability to serve more people. However, later as it talks about the nationwide network and the need to make unique national collections available (and again, it is talking here about the nouveau riche and the Harvards and the New York Public), proposing also that the federal government "help strengthen their ability to serve more people," the report simply suggests that the federal government should offer to compensate such institutions for performing added services, implying that it was up to the institutions themselves to determine whether they wanted to

accept or reject a national responsibility for developing and sustaining their own collections. I find that a disturbing inconsistency. Later in the record in fine print on one of the charts relating to federal support, reference is made to the giving of grants to help sustain unique collections in public and private libraries, but this is in fine print in one of the charts.

I would not want to omit at least passing reference to my concern that there appears to be something less than an impartial view of the copyright problem. My reading of the report is that the National Commission appears to be overly concerned about the economic incentives to the Information Industry. This, admittedly, is a complex issue. However, the purpose of the Commission as stated in its guiding ideal is, "to eventually provide any individual in the United States with equal opportunity of access to that part of the total information resource which will satisfy his educational, working, cultural, and leisure-time needs and interest, regardless of the individual's location, social or physical condition, or level of intellectual achievement." The National Commission, it seems to me might very well take a stand on the copyright issue that promulgates the fair use concept. Anything less than that will not serve the best interest of libraries and their users.

Finally, with respect to the organization of the national network, I support the emphasis of the state systems as the fundamental building blocks of the national network. The nationwide system that is proposed must be a workable, viable program with proper sharing of responsibility between the federal and state governments and the private sector. It probably ascribes more initiative to public libraries and to the state agencies than is warranted, especially in some areas of the United States. I think the record will show that as many multistate networks have been generated by the research libraries as by state agencies working together or by any influence of the federal government, and nowhere in the report does the National Commission give recognition to the leadership made by the research libraries.

The report, in my opinion, does not give sufficient emphasis to multistate systems, although Mr. Trezza did refer to this and said where it is needed, how it could be funded. Therefore, the report largely overlooks in the national program the reality of existing or emerging systems. I believe these multistate systems will play a vital role in the future, and I hoped that the National Commission would give more recognition to them.

* * * *

MR. DIX: This, it must be made clear again, is a personal reaction rather than an ARL reaction, of course. I do not know how many of you have seen the "Final Draft" but as Mr. Trezza said, it has a number of basic points that have not changed since earlier editions. But the final draft in one sense seems to me to say a great many good things. Certainly, none of us here would quarrel with what I take to be its basic contention as stated in the Introduction: "The Commission considers libraries, and the materials they contain, to be part of a national knowledge resource, that must be strengthened, integrated and sustained for all the people of the United States

to use as needed in the course of their personal and economic pursuits."

This theme is stated in various ways in different parts of the record, but not I think, with any intent to weaken or dilute the force of the three operative verbs; "strengthen", "integrate", "sustain."

The statement of the role of the federal government seems clear. The federal government has a continuing responsibility to implement innovative, flexible measures that will insure the continuation of libraries and information services. This seems to me a necessary plan that we all certainly endorse, and I think that in considering some of the details and the specific plans, we should not forget that it is very important to have a national governmentally-established Commission stating some of the basic things that we believe and have been saying. The report goes on to say that the cooperation which is required "is most appropriately fostered through federal legislation." Now the statement on university and research libraries, of particular interest to the ARL of course, seems to me a straightforward enough summary of our problems, as far as it goes.

On the other hand, Chapter 4, which first appears in the March 10 final draft, is or was pretty outrageous, it seemed to me, in its assumptions, and various other references to the information industry inserted in other parts of the report at that time seemed to me most unfortunate. I am sure, however, that these parts have now been substantially rewritten. I have seen a rewritten version of Chapter 4 which does seem to me to remove a great deal of the objectionable material, although I do find the rather slippery assumption that the so-called "private sector" means the commercial information industry an awkward kind of use. The first paragraph of the new Chapter 4 makes it very clear that the information industry as it is used here is a part of the private sector. But then it goes on and keeps using the phrase "private sector" to mean what I take to be the commercial sector, and I hope we will get in the habit of calling it the commercial sector. We are all parts of an information industry, I think, and I do not shutter at the word "industry" as applied to all of us. But there is a special subgroup that we are talking about here in Chapter 4, which is the commercial money-making sector. I think we ought to keep saying "commercial" and "money-making" because it makes an important distinction. Well, enough of that. I do not think we need quarrel, in other words, with that whole part, since I think there was enough response immediately so that the Commission has seen fit in its latest draft to remove apparently most of the objectionable kinds of things. I think it would have been a perversion of a public trust if the Commission had allowed itself to be used in some way by these people.

All of these sections of the report are, of course, the background for Chapter 6, "The Recommended National Program." With the eight listed priority objectives, I think one again can find little fault. Let me read them, since you have not seen them:

Objective 1: Ensure that basic minimums of library and information services adequate to meet the needs of all local communities are satisfied.

Objective 2: Provide adequate special services to special constituencies, including the unserved.

Objective 3: Strengthen existing statewide resources and systems.

Objective 4: Ensure basic and continuing education of personnel essential to the implementation of a National Program.

Objective 5: Coordinate existing federal programs of library and information service.

Objective 6: Make the private sector (comprising organizations which are not directly tax-supported) an active partner in the development of the National Program.

(This is that ambiguous use of the private sector again, I think.)

Objective 7: Establish a locus of federal responsibility charged with implementing the national network and coordinating the National Program under the policy guidance of the National Commission.

Objective 8: Plan, develop, and implement a nationwide network of library and information service.

As I say, I do not think we can quarrel with those objectives as they are stated. As Mr. Trezza says, this document has to be really rather bland in most ways. Any of you who work some with international organizations, remember that the more people you have got to satisfy and to get agreement from, the blander the document tends to get, and I do not see any remedy for that.

However, there are several areas in these program objectives where I think we in the ARL should be alerted as this program is developed and spelled out in detail. I am not quite clear where support of the great scholarly research libraries is spelled out in these numbered objectives. This is a point that Mr. Hopp made.

In objective two, there is talk about providing "adequate special services to special constituencies." They talk about the blind persons, Indians, other special groups, but not scholars. And if they are not a special constituency, where do they fit in this whole program? Where in this program does one turn to make sure that the country's research resources for the study of China, for example, are being developed, coordinated, and maintained properly?

Two, we should have some concern, I think about the emphasis being placed upon the states as building blocks, particularly in funding. I am just worried

about the emphasis; I can see how it got there: the state is a natural unit in terms of legislation; as a bibliographic unit, it does not make any se se at all, as we know, and I think the problem is going to have to be to merge the funding possibilities of the states with some way of jumping across state boundaries easily for a variety of things relating to bibliographics and services.

Objective three speaks of "the understanding that the federal government would fund those aspects of the National Program that are of common concern nationally, in return for a commitment on the part of the states to accept, in cooperation with the local governments, a fair share of the responsibility for funding libraries within their own jurisdictions." This is a reasonable pattern. Does it cover all the needs of the research library? Again, will the combination of governments support NYPL adequately, or will the federal government, Massachusetts and Cambridge combine to support Harvard? I rather doubt it, and yet Harvard is a national resource and a national institution.

Three, both of these institutions and others are mentioned by name in the next section outlining the network concept where it is suggested that "the federal government would offer to compensate such institutions for performing added services." I think we shall have to make sure that the plan, as it develops, provides not merely some sort of handling charge or fee, but also continuing support, recognizing the value of the collections themselves. In other words, I see nothing here that suggests the thinking of ways of compensating these great, unique, special resources. Nothing is kept in mind other than something like the New York system, by which a really very modest and token fee is applied to reimburse for the charge of lending something. What we need and what we have to have is some mechanism by which the federal government itself pours substantial money into solving the problems of the great research libraries of the kind represented in this room, not necessarily by handouts to individual libraries, but, as I have been saying for a good while, by massive central programs of activity which will enable us to do better the things we need to do and relieve certain resources for us to do things locally.

Going on to objective seven: "Establish a locus of federal responsibility". This is terribly important, and we in the ARL have a substantial stock in seeing that the right kind of "permanent operating agency" emerges. This report does not recommend what that agency should be, and probably should not, but we think we want to give a lot of attention to that part.

Objective eight: "Plan, develop, and implement a nationwide network" is, of course the key section. I personally think that the plan which is outlined here is broad and loose enough to permit the development of a national network along lines which are compatible with the measures seen necessary by ARL libraries in order to serve their constituencies, but there will have to be, I think, continuing input by ARL as these plans are flushed out and as information is developed. This input, at the minimum I think, should be a continuing series of sharp questions which Mr. Trezza has asked for, formulated by an appropriate ARL group.

These are samples of the kinds of questions I think we should keep addressing to the Commission: Precisely how and through what specific legislation does the Commission plan for future action implemented by the Commission to move us to the realization of an effective operating national lending library, beginning with journals and perhaps moving along to other areas? We have talked about this for years. We have obviously got to have it. It has, I think, very little to do with all of the state areas. I think this is something where individual libraries can go directly to the center. The report uses this language; it speaks of this in connection with sequential service levels. I have some doubt that a national lending library should serve only as a library of last resort after a rather laborious process of going up through local and state levels. It did not seem to be necessary for Boston Spa, and I do not think it should be. We will have further talk about that this morning.

What I am saying is I think ARL should be asking questions about such issues of that sort. Another one: may we see and discuss (and I am sure we will at the appropriate time) one or more precise models of a national machine-readable data base containing impeccable and authoritative bibliographic information, series numbers, perhaps journal titles; with plans for its funding, its current management and the variety of services which it can offer to all of us. This is the key, I think, to the whole thing. How do we get there from here, in other words.

It seems to me then of the greatest importance to work very closely with the Commission. I, myself, think (and I partially blame myself for this), we have not worked as closely as one would like. I had a personal opportunity to do some rewriting of a draft a year ago and then went off to the hospital and did not do it. I think we have got to help and not just point out the lacks, but make suggestions as to how we can fill them in. We need to help the Commission move a program which will help us in the direction of these worthy objectives which it has enunciated. We look to Frederick Burkhardt, Alphonse Trezza and our associates on the Commission to move us out of the woods here. We are in a kind of a Big Thicket, and we need guidance. I think Mr. Trezza's evangelistic impulses are very appropriate in this East Texas setting. I think that we will get a great deal out of all of these activities of the Commission. I do not mean to sound overly critical. I do think, though, that I endorse really everything that Ralph Hopp has said. He put it better than I have, except I think perhaps he gave too much praise to the state concept. That I have my own doubts about.

* * * *

Discussion

MR. DE GENNARO: I knew that we had selected the two best ARL reactors. I think that although they claim to be just speaking their personal views, I am sure that they really expressed many of the concerns that all of us have in this room. I thank them both very much for their efforts and their presentations. And now I think we would be ready for questions and discussions.

MR. SPARKS: I have a fundamental, philosophical problem with this document. It fails, I think, to observe a social dynamic of the United States. Two hundred years ago when we established this republic, we did recognize private property as one of the principles or dynamic forces in the society. Now ever since Teddy Roosevelt's time and the early decades of this century, there has been a tension in this country between public policy and private property. We see this in the income tax and corporate profit tax. We saw it in the labor unions in the 30's and the social legislation that has been set down since then. But this document really does not recognize that social dynamic, and we get into trouble about the private sector because we are using a jargon term; we are not really referring to the fundamental tension which exists here between private ownership and public need. This is, I think, the basic difficulty of this country.

I speak as a person representing a private institution. I know my Board of Trustees will see their fiscal responsibility towards the property which is the preserve of that institution, and will see the work of this Commission in terms of that private ownership. I do not mean to suggest by this that the resolution of this tension is an impossibility. But I think to work constructively toward the future, we have to recognize that tension, and we have to devise the means of balancing those two forces in the library economy of the nation.

This is my fundamental wrestling with the document, exemplified perhaps in the question where we do recognize constitutional rights to private property as they are recognized in copyright? And do we recognize constitutional rights to privacy? But there is a lacuna here; there is something missing, and what I would like to do is to raise this question on the more general level of a social dynamic of the United States, of the nation we live in, and without at all denying the public purpose that is behind the document.

MR. TREZZA: A general comment on the statement about the reasons we say things about the academic or research libraries: the point that Mr. Sparks just made is one we are worried about. That is, you have to word it in such a way that it does not say you have got to do it. So then when you say you may do it, you say then it is wishy-washy. That is our problem. As I told you, this dynamic document is changing constantly. The latest wording intends to suggest the provision of the means for protecting unique and major resources to enable them to serve more people than their primary clientele. To achieve this the federal government would offer to compensate the institution, which in turn would have the option of accepting or rejecting this national responsibility. So, in other words, we are saying, "you are a private institution!" You have the right to say, "I don't want to play." How do we balance this off? This is one of the limits we face in the whole document. How do you balance, in the one way, the right of the institution to maintain autonomy or reasonable autonomy, at least, and to maintain its viability? This is a constant problem. That is the reason we say that where this will be important is when we start implementing. As we start writing the implementing language in the legislation, that is when we have to make sure that there is full support for every word, because it is going to be the law. In a document talking policy, it is a little bit different. We are going to be at the (well, "mercy" is too strong

a word) of the people in government who write rules and regulations. So at that stage, we are going to have some of these problems.

Now, just one more point while I am up. The Commission has already moved in four areas for implementation, and you have been involved in, I think, all four. One is copyright. As you well know, the Commission, along with the Office of the Register of Copyrights in the Library of Congress, have been trying to get the librarians on one side and the publishers on the other to work toward resolving some of the problems in copyright. Secondly, the Commission worked towards implementing a continuing education program on the local level, and ARL is involved in that. Thirdly, the Commission sponsored a meeting a month or so ago in Washington where ARL was heavily represented, where we discussed the whole problem of resource sharing on a regional and national basis. You will hear some of that after I get through. And fourth, we are cooperating with the Council on Library Resources and the National Science Foundation on a national bibliographic control project which is aimed at, again, working toward one of our goals. And we are now considering a proposal for the Library of Congress which the Commission would hope to fund in moving even more in this direction.

So we are actually moving, and everytime we start to get some idea we want to push toward, we make sure that the proper constituency is involved. And in almost every single case so far, ARL has been a part of it. We will continue to make you a part of it; I can guarantee it.

MR. AXFORD: I would like to pursue Mr. Sparks' point just a little bit. I think he did an admirable job of giving a historical perspective to a very interesting problem; it is one in which we are already trying to come to terms with what you might call "federal government interference" with the administration of both public and private institutions. But I think it is only fair to point out that if we do not like the cost of affirmative action programs, the cost of equal-pay-for-equal-work programs, the paper work, the reporting, the intrusion of the Department of Labor and HEW into our operation, there is one simple solution, and that is to keep out of the federal trough. Now I have suggested this at several institutions, but they do not want to pay the price of that. This may be something that we will have to consider: once you accept public money, then you are going to accept public interference in the administration of your institution. Now that may be a choice.

What I might suggest is that there may be an institution or two in which institutional autonomy, the rights of ownership of private property, may seem more important in terms of even national goals, than participation in a network which will effectively transfer a good deal of decision-making elsewhere.

MR. SPARKS: I understand what you mean. Let me put it on a local level. Over in Elkart, 15 miles away from Notre Dame, is Miles Laboratory, one of the best pharmaceutical laboratories in the country. We have a microbiology and a biology department, and we all subscribe to the same journals, and the thought has occurred to both Notre Dame and Miles Laboratories that we do not need to have this duplication. But sharing resoures means sharing clientele.

That is the other side of the coin, you see. You have to say, "Well, we are willing to accept the scientists that are working at Miles as clients for us, and they are willing to accept a certain number of our students and professionals over there as clients for their laboratory." That may not be all bad, but this comes about by that instrumentality which breaches the frontier of private property, which is the contract.

Now we do this between private institutions and people constantly; we have from the beginning of the republic. And we have done this between states in interstate compacting, for example. This, I think, leads us to some techniques which may be used by the Commission for precisely this sort of thing. When we get into the practical matter of dealing with private property and public utility, we can make use of this context. I was not trying to be a rescinder; I am not trying to be a dog in the manger here, but just to point out that there are some basic principles involved.

MR. BOSS: I think it was very helpful to have Mr. Dix and Mr. Hopp look more carefully perhaps, than any of the rest of us did who had access to this document, and to report their views. I think from the reactions I saw, those views were representative of many of us, although I know all of us will have an opportunity to see the final document before our October meeting, at which we will be asked to respond as ARL.

I would like to recommend for consideration by the membership and the ARL Board that we follow a pattern not unlike today's pattern -- that is, to have a small panel of reactors attempt to synthesize for the benefit of the group as a whole, so that our October discussion will be facilitated. I think that it was a very excellent way to focus on the critical issues involved in the document.

MR. DE GENNARO: Your suggestion will be duly noted. Are there any other questions or comments?

MR. LORENZ: I would like to clarify the schedule as outlined by Mr. Trezza. As I understand it, the full Commission will be getting copies of the final copy as prepared by GPO in advance of the Commission meeting in Philadelphia, May 22 and 23. At that time, the Commission will have an opportunity, really for the first time, to consider these latest revisions in the document. I understand from Mr. Trezza that further changes can be made in the galley before it is a final document that is printed and distributed. I think some very good suggestions have been made today, and I would say if some of those could be synthesized, they might still be useful at the Philadelphia meeting of the Commission.

MR. TREZZA: Actually if you have any language in specific parts of the document that you think might be useful, even if I got them by the end of the day or Monday, I might still be able to work some in. This should involve primarily providing background for Chapter 4. The rest of the document everybody had seen over a period of time. Chapter 4 has gone through one very major revision within a week of its release, then a second revision which

was, again, fairly major, and since that time, one more. So that chapter has been revised five times in three weeks, and I want you to know that the people that responded to it and whose ideas we used were first of all, at least three of our Commissioners who gave us detailed comments on different parts of it. Mr. Townsend Hoopes representing the Association of American Publishers, Mr. Paul Zurkowski representing Information Industry Association, Richard De Gennaro representing ARL, Ben Weil representing abstracting and indexing services. We got some comments at the very last minute, not on Chapter 4 particularly, but on the thing as a whole, from NELINET. I will use one idea from that one so it does represent this constituency. That is the reason why it is repetitive, and that is why it says things over and over and over. It is a very difficult thing to constantly edit this thing day by day by day. I spent 25 minutes on the phone this morning calling in all the changes I have done on the road.

I have been in constant touch with Dr. Burkhardt and Joseph Becker, so we are constantly working on this document. So what you are going to get is a document which, I think, will be generally supportive of what you want. We give it to GPO Monday. That same day it will be mailed to each Commissioner. The Commissioners will have an opportunity between that time and the time of the meeting in Philadelphia to review it. By then, we are going to ask them to give us any comments by phone right away so we can start working them in before the Commission meetings, and then the Commission will take one last look. The changes they are going to make are not final. There are a lot of changes you can make in one word here, a little emphasis here, or drop a sentence here. These are things you can do. To the extent we do too much of that, it will delay our printing schedule. That is all right; I would rather delay the printing schedule a week than to have one word go in which might overshadow the rest of the document. That is our concern. So all I ask is that when you read the document, try to read it as a whole. Try to remember that if we say something which may look strong, for example, in Chapter 4 (by the way, it is now Chapter 3) we may have said something equally as strongly in some other chapter about somebody else, and so read the whole document.

We try to emphasize it as a living document which will be revised on a continual basis. Otherwide, it is not long-range planning. We are going to try, in other words, to offer to everybody the idea that you and I should constantly involve ourselves in long-range planning, constantly thinking of the goal, the objectives and how to get there, and changing almost day-by-day to achieve it, because what we are interested in is not confrontation, but conciliation; we are interested in achieving the goal which we are all working for.

We are known as professionals for one reason: to serve the people of the country. We are not only to serve our particular clientele. That is why I keep saying if we at least all agree that we all have the same goal in mind, at least we will take everybody's criticisms in the right spirit.

MR. AXFORD: Do you see any trouble in incorporating Mr. Dix's suggestions that you get "commercial" in there and clear up that ambiguous use of "private sector"?

MR. TREZZA: "Commercial" is in there, but so is "private sector." You see the problem you have got is more complex: the special libraries have a very strong view on the use of "private sector;" the Information Industry has another; the publishers have a third; you have a fourth. What I am saying is our use is a combination of all these concerns. Two days were spent writing language on that whole item. What we have had to do is use "private sector not-for-profit" and "private sector for-profit," and we have used that distinction. Trying to clarify it we will say "the for-profit part of the sector," which really is commercial, and then it will say the "not-for-profit part of the sector" which is what your private institutions are, you see. So we have cleaned that up. We use "special" and we have crossed out "commercial," and use "organization" and we use "information;" you cross it out and used "private sector" and when you get "private sector," you cross it out and use "information" and "industry," and it is really an interesting problem; and I am not sure I want to go through it again.

MR. DE GENNARO: Well, I think this is a good place to conclude this part of the program. I want to thank once again our speaker, Alphonse Trezza, and the two panelists for the excellent job that they have done.

* * * *

Introduction

MR. DE GENNARO: This morning, we heard points of view from Mr. Trezza, William Dix and Ralph Hopp, and the next hour or so, you are going to hear another set of points of view from three other speakers. I think the whole question of point of view is terribly important, and to illustrate that, let me read you an excerpt from a review of Lady Chatterly's Lover that appeared in Field And Stream Magazine. It says, and I quote:

> This fictional account of the day-to-day life of an English gamekeeper is of considerable interest to outdoor-minded readers as it contains many pages on pheasant raising, on apprehending of poachers, ways to control vermin, and other chores and duties of the professional gamekeeper. Unfortunately, one is obliged to wade through many pages of extraneous material in order to discover and savor those sidelights of the management of a midland shooting estate. This book cannot, however, take the place of J.R. Miller's Practical Gamekeeping.

So you see, viewpoint does make a difference.

I am going to call first on Basil Stuart-Stubbs to provide us with a historical background on this whole question. I do not need to introduce Basil Stuart-Stubbs from the University of British Columiba, and I do not need to introduce Arthur Hamlin. I do not even think I need to introduce Vernon Palmour, but since he may be new to some, let me just say briefly that he is with the Public Research Institute. He was the Vice President for Westat, Inc. He has a M.S. in Statistics from the University of Wyoming. He has completed course work for a Ph.D in Mathematical Studies at George Washington University. His most recent study was done for the National Commission and is entitled Resources and Bibliographic Support for a Nationwide Library Program. He has done three studies for ARL: A Study of the Characteristics, Costs and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries, Methods of Financing Interlibrary Loan Services, and Access to Periodical Resources: A National Plan. So you see, Mr. Palmour is well qualified to speak to us on these subjects.

* * * *

MR. STUART-STUBBS: I would like you to join me in recalling a time in North America, now nearly beyond memory, when the population was half of what it is today, when there was fewer than ten miles of pavement in the entire continent, when there was fewer than 18 million horses and 10 million bicycles and just a few awkward motorized vehicles bumping along the dusty roads.

Specifically, I want you to recall the year just before the turn of the century when William McKinley was your President and Sir Wilfrid Laurier was our Prime Minister. In that year McKinley was contending with a popular uprising against the U.S. presence in the Philippines, and Laurier was mobilizing a volunteer contingent to dispatch to the Boer War. While thousands of foolhardy adventurers flocked to the Yukon gold fields, Amundsen was preparing for a voyage through the Northwest Passage and Perry was planning an expedition to the North Pole. There seemed to be no connection at the time, but 1899 saw the invention of magnetic sound recording and aspirin. In that year Horatio Alger, Jr. passed away, Scott Joplin published his first composition, Sibelius completed his first symphony, Jim Jeffries knocked out Ruby Bob Fitzsimmons, and out in a small town in Ohio a boy called Keyes Metcalf celebrated his tenth birthday. These random facts, I hope, give you some feeling of those times, now three-quarters of a century past.

Then as now, librarians were given to convening meetings, one of which was held in Atlantic City in March. This was the first joint meeting of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Library Associations and the New York Library Club. Late one evening the librarian of Princeton University rose to speak. He was a bright and energetic man, just like the next in the line of succession, Richard Boss, on this side of his fortieth year.

According to one reporter, Ernest Cushing Richardson delivered:

> a forcible and scholarly plea for the establishment of what the speaker termed a 'National Lending Library' for libraries, either independent or as a department of the Library of Congress, intended to bring to students and investigators the material necessary in their work and unobtainable in local libraries, and to form the center of a great organized system of interlibrary loans.

Unfortunately the full text of Richardson's remarks are nowhere recorded, and no action seems to have been taken by the meeting which heard this revolutionary proposal for the first time. However, Richardson was not the sort to let matters rest. A few months later the annual meeting of the American Library Association in Atlanta presented him with another opportunity to put forward his idea. There was a record attendance that year: 215 delegates, including a solitary Canadian, Charles Gould, the Librarian of McGill University. The President of the Association was William Coolidge Lane, the Librarian of Harvard University. Both these men were in the audience at Kimball House when Richardson spoke again, this time under the rubric of "Cooperation in Lending Among College and Reference Libraries."

He noted that of the 8600 periodicals listed in Bolton's Catalogue of Scientific Periodicals, two-thirds were not to be found in any library in the United States, and that of the remaining third, a third again existed in but a single copy. However, he did not propose that libraries commence to build their subscription lists indiscriminately in order to remove this obvious weakness in national resources. On the contrary, he predicted that such an approach would lead to senseless duplication and result in the waste,

overtime, of 250 million dollars.

"The ideal way of meeting this situation for economy and convenience," he said, "is undoubtedly a central, national lending library of least frequently-needed books - a library having, perhaps, a central library in Washington with branches in New Orleans, San Francisco, Chicago and New York."

Since he did not believe (and in this he proved right) that such a library could be brought into existence quickly, he instead proposed as an interim measure only, the rationalization of the collecting of periodicals among academic libraries in a way which would ensure that in each region files of less-frequently consulted journals would be distributed among libraries so that all could share equally in the responsibility for maintaining and lending these titles.

In the decade that followed, both William Lane and Charles Gould joined Ernest Richardson as vigorous proponents of a national lending library. The three men were all President of the American Library Association during that period, and used the office as a platform from which they attempted to persuade the membership of the value of sucn a scheme. Here is Gould on the subject, writing in 1908:

> Let us suppose, then, the whole continent to be divided into a few great regions or districts, and that in each after careful consultation and due consideration, a truly great library is developed out of existing resources, or de novo.
>
> Each of these regional libraries would serve as a reservoir upon which all the libraries of the district might freely draw. They would cooperate unrestrictedly with each other in matters of exchange, loan, purchase of rare or particularly costly works. It would seem equally reasonable that they would materially help to dispose of the vexing question as to the storage of so-called 'dead' books.

And here is Lane, speaking in the same year at the dedication of a new library building at Oberlin College, an event which Keyes Metcalf might recall because he was working there in 1908:

> Here are two directions then, in which our proposed Central Lending Library could profitably collect books to be lent -- expensive individual books which may already exist in several libraries, but which those libraries are unable to lend and will be more and more compelled to retain for the use of their own readers, and secondly, works, especially sets of the publications of the learned societies, not already owned anywhere in America.

Lane even spoke about the character of the building as being "different

from any now in existence. It may be an absolutely simple plan architecturally, it may be entirely devoid of monument, but it should be completely fireproof. Its interior will be almost altogether devoted to storage ..." He estimated the the cost of the initial building to be $50,000. If Keyes Metcalf was indeed in the audience that day, I believe you will enjoy as I do the delicious irony of the then librarian of Harvard, giving the future librarian of Harvard the specifications of the New England Depository Library.

The next year the American Library Association met at Bretton Woods, and Charles Gould was on his feet again to argue for the development of what he now termed "reservoir libraries." "One sees, or thinks he can see," he said, "a chain of regional libraries throughout the United States and Canada, because the scope of such institutions ought to be avowedly continental if not international."

Well, here we are in Houston, and it is 1975. Whatever happened to these good old-fashioned ideas? I hesitate to render this verdict, because I was not around at the turn of the century, but my reading of the yellowing pages of the Library Journal leads me to suspect that a well-meaning spokeman for the Library of Congress may have been responsible for bringing the drive for a national lending library to a sudden halt. William Warner Bishop had been a cataloger at Princeton, working under Ernest Richardson, but by 1909 he had become the Superintendent of the Reading Room at the Library of Congress, and, as sometimes happens, he was not ready to meet his old boss head on.

At the Bretton Woods conference, the College and Reference Section, the predecessor to ACRL, after listening to Lane and Gould, passed a resolution requesting the Council of the American Library Association to set up a special committee to pursue the subject of a national lending library. Bishop was, in fact, the Chairman of that Section, and felt that in that position he could not oppose the will of the majority. But following the meeting, he prepared a paper in general opposition to the Richardson scheme and submitted it to the Library Journal where it appeared in December. This is what he said:

> The national library already lends freely and is prepared to continue this policy. It does not refuse to lend volumes in sets of transactions or other serials. It has placed no limit on the number of volumes it will lend to one institution at one time. It has duplicates of many important sets and will doubtless acquire more. There is no reason to expect that its purchases will grow less. No library created out of hand could for years to come supply anything like the number of books wanted on interlibrary loan which the Library of Congress can supply. If then the Library of Congress will try to do these things for individuals and for libraries, is it not on the way toward becoming a national lending library for libraries?

To which question, unfortunately, the intervening decades seem to have a negative reply.

For me, one of the most poignant statements in this tale of lost opportunity is one made by my countryman, Charles Gould. I quote, "in certain respects in her relatively few libraries, her great distances and small population, Canada seems to be ideally placed for making an initial experiment of this nature." He was referring, of course, to the possibility of a national lending library for Canada. I think there is still some merit to that idea.

For the past year a few of my colleagues and I have been exhausting the subject of interlibrary loan in Canada and exhausting ourselves in the process. We have now delivered a 400-page report to the National Librarian, who commissioned the study. I believe it is his intention, out of his concern for your individual space problems, to publish the study in microform. Actually, despite its bulk, there is nothing in it that would surprise any of you who have been reading the collected works of Palmour, Thomson, et al; interlibrary loan in Canada is very much like interlibrary loan in the United States, with the possible exception of the fact that we seem to turn to libraries in this country for about 11 percent of the items we borrow, whereas only two percent of the items loaned by Canadian libraries are sent to destinations in the U.S. So we have a balance of trade problem.

However, university libraries in Canada are in roughly the same situation as university libraries in the U.S. where interlibrary loan is concerned. That is, they are the major repositories of collections, hold most of the periodical files and maintain most of the subscriptions in the country. As a natural result they attract interlibrary loan requests from other types of libraries as well as from each other. Roughly one half of the loans made by Canadian university libraries are made to other university libraries, a third are made to government and special libraries, and a tenth to college and public libraries. But there are not that many university libraries in Canada -- about 60 -- and of those only a handful have collections exceeding a million volumes. Those of us who are at the top of our insignificant heap are the major net lenders in the country, and it is beginning to hurt. Indications are that it will hurt even more, because the rate of borrowing by government libraries is going up at an average rate of 20 percent a year., and by special libraries at a rate of 11 percent a year, and university libraries are the favorite sources.

We examined the content of items loaned and borrowed, and learned that about two-thirds of the items provided by university libraries are periodicals, which is higher than the 48 percent figure for United States university libraries as determined by Palmour. Of those periodicals loaned or copied, a third had been published since 1970, another fifth had been published since 1965 and another tenth since 1960; in other words, nearly two-thirds had been published in the last 15 years. Despite the fact that our country has two official languages, over 90 percent of these journals loaned were in English. Journals in the life, health and social sciences account for about one half of the transactions. At the same time, the survey revealed that the National Library of Canada and the Canadian Institute for Scientific and Technical

Information, formerly the National Science Library, are supplying at present about 17 percent of all items borrowed by libraries of all kinds in Canada.

The National Librarian reports that about a quarter of the items for which locations are requested of the National Union Catalog can be supplied from the National Library's own collection, which is not large, and which is heavily Canadian in content. Our experience in borrowing from the National Library has been very good, although we are in the western extreme of the country. Turnaround time on interlibrary loan from Ottawa is better than from some of our more immediate neighbors, providing the weather is good and no one in the communications business is on strike. So even though the national libraries are not committed to a program of centralized interlibrary lending, service is efficient.

In my mind, all of this points to the practicability and desirability of a national periodicals bank, presumably built on the existing resources and services already in the capital city. Such a bank would have the effect of redirecting the interlibrary loan traffic away from the university libraries where decreased budgets are making it more and more difficult to carry on conventional interlibrary loan operations. The traffic would be directed toward a facility which was organized to achieve a single objective efficiently: the delivery of periodical articles, principally in English, principally of recent origin. Since two-thirds of the items borrowed by government and special libraries are in periodical format, and since these libraries are concentrated in the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal triangle, such a periodicals bank would improve their information services markedly.

Thus, in the Canadian situation I see the major beneficiaries of a national periodicals lending collection as the government, special and other small libraries of all types. These are the libraries for whom it is impractical or impossible to sustain comprehensive subscription lists, but whose clientele have need of access to the journal literature. I do not particularly see as a great a benefit to the university libraries, except insofar as their share of the interlibrary loan traffic would be diminished. I doubt that the universities will be able to cancel subscriptions in great numbers as the result of the existence of a central, comprehensive collection.

So far the experience of the Center for Research Libraries has not brought about a massive tide of cancellations among members. In my home province our three universities have been trying to rationalize our serials list, and we must have spent about $25,000 in staff time to come up with a few thousand dollars' worth of journals which we felt able to cancel. The hard fact is that journals are vital to academic library collections and to the quality of service such libraries can render their very demanding clientele. It is because of this that I believe that the publishers need not fear the existence of a national lending library for periodicals. Those who are present subscribers will not be able to drop titles without feeling acute pain, and those who are not subscribers now are not able to become subscribers, either because they do not have the money and cannot get it, or because their use

of some titles is so infrequent as to make subscriptions unnecessary.

To sum up, I do think that we have talked long enough about national lending collections, whether centralized or regionalized, that we have studied interlibrary loan enough and know enough about user needs, enough about the character of interlibrary loan traffic, enough about borrowing patterns among types of libraries. Common sense and evidence point in the same direction, and that is the one indicated long ago by Richardson, Lane, and Gould. I suggest that steps be taken now not to celebrate the centennial of their good idea in 1999. Thank you.

* * * *

MR. PALMOUR: The only thing I can say after hearing that is I am glad we are still in the mainstream of historical thought, in that we are talking about the same thing anyway. I might preface what I am going to say with a couple of comments. I think in the program it said that I was talking on the NCLIS perspective. Actually, I am going to be talking about a study that we did for the National Commission; I am not sure it is the NCLIS perspective by any means.

I also enjoyed a comment yesterday by Professor Machlup who indicated that in his study he was not going to draw recommendations; he was only going to present the evidence that he found. We had that pleasure in the first study we did for ARL, when essentially we just looked at the character of interlibrary loans. Subdequently we have had to try to put those findings in some form of recommendations. We did not always have the data we really would like to have had to support some of the recommendations, but in the end the recommendations represent our best guesses or else consensus from a number of people.

And so I would like to really talk about the last in a series of Westat studies, and I can say that because Westat is no longer in the business of conducting library studies. This study grew out of the National Program for Library and Information Services as proposed by the National Commission. As you have already heard, one of the eight program objectives of the Commission, is to "plan, develop and implement a nationwide network of library and information service." This nationwide network is further defined in the program document as a single unified system encompassing state networks, multistate networks, and specialized networks in the public and private sectors. Anticipating a national network as a priority program objective, the National Commission contracted in June of 1973 with Westat to investigate the role of resource centers and bibliographic centers in such a network. Based on analyses of existing centers the study was to recommend a plan for future development of a national network of resources and bibliographic centers for access to texts, tapes, graphics, and other library materials.

The impetus for this study was a growing concern for interlibrary loan. Recognizing the inequities and inefficiencies of the present interlibrary loan system, the National Commission sought improved techniques on providing

interlibrary loan service. Furthermore it was stated that these techniques should be applied in a series of state, regional, and topical resource centers as components in the nationwide network. The bibliographic centers were to serve as filters in the network providing the bibliographic control necessary. The study report was completed in August of 1974 and was published by the National Commission recently through the GPO. The title of the report is Resources and Bibliographic Support for a Nationwide Library Program.

I would like to draw your attention to some of the major recommendations in the study as it stands, and to wind up by making just a few comments on the two-day meeting that took place early in April, where we did discuss the recommendations presented in the study and attempted to get some consensus from the group there representing the library community. The approach taken in this investigation relied heavily upon the earlier ARL research on interlibrary loans, which I believe most of you are familiar with. In this study we collected only a small amount of new data. These data were primarily from special and public libraries, trying to get a handle on the magnitude of interlibrary loan activity from these groups. Information was also obtained from state agencies to try to get a handle on the networking activity already going on, as well as a look at anticipated operations. Visits were made to most of the existing multistate library networks in order to have a good understanding of what services they are now providing and will attempt to provide in the future. But in the end our main thrust in the study was to define a structure for organizing resource centers and bibliographic centers. I had a feeling after a couple of these studies that there was very little in the world of networking that has not been said in the past. But hopefully, we did have some recommendations on how to implement this which will be useful.

As far as alternatives in the study, those that we looked at were really concerned with how to link existing resource centers, although we certainly did not ignore the possibility of the need for new resource centers. But for the most part, we are talking about the existing libraries as resource centers. And so the primary alternatives that we considered were various ways of linking resource centers and the bibliographic centers into some meaningful network. The process of going beyond the local level for both location and physical access is best accomplished by a hierarchical network, although not necessarily for all kinds of material. This is even more evident with regard to bibliographic services; clearly not every institution can commence the development of a MARC-type data base, for instance.

We look to the application of computer technology to allow the development of required data bases by a few centers, mostly at regional levels. I do not have to highlight the high cost of duplication and technical processing to this group; it is well-known. Physical delivery of materials is already accomplished in many areas, even within many states, in hierarchical systems. One of the more difficult aspects of designing hierarchical networks is the determination of the appropriate level at which funds should be allocated, and I should mention that this is one area where perhaps we stepped

out of bounds in terms of the data we had and the problems of trying to work with existing building blocks. If one would look at the hierarchical design from strictly that of a systems point of view or from just an economic point of view, then one might adopt a much more centralized approach than you would by developing from the building blocks as they exist now. But I am not sure of that.

For example, one alternative that we looked at was that of a single bibliographic center serving the entire country. In our investigation we felt that the size and the magnitude of the service was the driving force that really prevented the concept of a single center. The framework that emerged was one of five operational levels: local, state, multistate (being a zone which was really geared for the delivery of materials, providing for physical access), and then the regional, which is a multizone level in this case, and the national level. The recommended approach attempted to account for the current patterns and developments that we now see in this country, and to try to draw them together, as I have said.

The major recommendations of the study I would just like to review briefly. I will essentially give them in the order that they appeared in the summary of the report, then I will go back and give a little detail on a couple of them.

1. That a National Library Network be established under the general direction of a "national library coordinating agency" comprised of three coordinated systems:

   a. A Resource System designed to provide equal opportunity of access to all needed materials through the designation or development of libraries or other information facilities which will provide such access.

   b. A Bibliographic System designed to provide a unique authoritative bibliographic description of holdings to be used for shared cataloging and location files.

   c. A Communications System to provide on-line communication of bibliographic data and requests for data and services between the various levels of the network.

The emphasis of our study was on the first two: the resource system and the bibliographic system, so I am not going to say much at all about the communications system. The second recommendation in our report is:

2. That the Library of Congress be designated as implementor and coordinator in the expansion of the MARC data base to provide the comprehensive authoritative bibliographic data

base. In addition, the study also suggests that the Library of Congress play an expanded role in the resource chain as well.

3. That operational responsibility for the network should rest largely at the regional level made up of four Regional Library Support Centers.

4. That in contrast to the bibliographic function which will be handled at the regional-national level primarily, delivery zones be established as sub-units of the multi-state regions.

5. That individual states should designate the state library and/or other independent libraries or agencies in the state as a point of access to the network.

And in this, I should say certainly to this group that the design would allow for large libraries primarily to circumvent this access point, but I think these would be things that would be worked out in the various regions and in the states.

6. That individual libraries be designated as resource libraries within each level of the network, and going along with this, there would be some form of required compensation.

Now to just briefly comment on the resource system, I have already mentioned there would be primarily a hierarchy of service points, building on the local libraries through the state networks and resource zones and the regional facilities. We discussed that the country be divided up into four regions. There is nothing magic about this number. As I said, the driving force is primarily that for bibliographic data base requirements, we felt that four was a reasonable number. Certainly when we look around, we see OCLC -- they are already playing a major role in this; also there is the Washington Library Network, MIDLNET, and others that are already involved in these activities. And so, whether four regions will emerge or not, we do not know, but for purposes of this record, we talk in terms of about four.

Within these regions we talked in terms of the delivery zone, which consists of nothing more than perhaps four or five connecting states, and is primarily for the actual delivery of the documents. Interlibrary loans would continue to be generated at the local level. They would pass up through the state. There would be some protocol as to certain functions required within the state before the request would come into the zonal level and finally into the regional level. Each state would play an important part in that. I have already mentioned they would designate either a single state resource center or perhaps a group of centers which would have three primary network functions at the state level: 1) to serve as a backup resource to the in-state libraries; 2) to serve as a state outlet into the zonal and regional level; 3) to serve as an input channel for loan requests coming into that

state. And this simply says the zonal or delivery level might consist of five state resource centers, assuming that these states had only designated a single resource center each. Compensation to the state resource centers would come from the federal library network or the federal government for loans outside the state, but loans within the state would have to be paid for by the state. The need for continued strengthening of the state systems would not be removed by the national and regional network that I am talking about.

Now at the regional level (and again using this number four just as an example), we envision regional library support centers. These would primarily coordinate the bibliographic support, and they might well be one of the resource centers that have been designated for physical access of materials as well. But certain libraries also would be designated as regional resource centers to fill requests which will be transmitted through the zonal levels and still remain unfilled.

At the regional level we also suggest something we have called a Regional Last Copy Depository. I am not sure that was a proper terminology. This really came about from the public library side. There was great feeling from some of the large public libraries that there was a need for essentially a warehouse at the regional level for storing items they need to get off their shelves.

Finally, a national level would exist, being made up of designated resource libraries. Certain strong topical collections would be considered as national resources. Also at this level, the existing national libraries and the Center for Research Libraries would play an important role. For periodical materials we recommend the development of a national periodical resource center as a component in this network in line with what we have already done in the study for ARL. Unfortunately, one of the weaknesses in the report for the Commission was our somwhat inconsistent handling of the idea of a periodical system involving some center. Some of you recall that these two investigations overlapped; we were busy trying to write the ARL report, and essentially we sort of short-changed the idea of a periodical center in the subsequent report for the Commission, essentially alluding to the ARL study. I think that has been corrected now, as I will talk about in just a few moments. But essentially this concept of a periodical center included in the ARL report was also in the more recent Commission report.

Now, to quickly turn to the bibliographic side of the system, I do not think I have to say much about this. There is a number of activities going on; you are probably more aware of most of them than I am. The driving force behind our suggestion of dividing the country into these regions was really the bibliographic activities, as I have already said. The primary provision of bibliographic services, such as location and cataloging data, would be the responsibility of these four regions, but the development of the data base would primarily be the responsibility of the Library of Congress. We would envision an expansion of the MARC-data which would include high quality cataloging data coming from other sources as well. This data base would be

on-line, and of course, would be drawn upon heavily by the regional centers. A location center would be available at the regional centers for the materials held by the resource libraries in those areas.

I will not comment now on how all the other components, such as CONSER and all the others, fit in. Obviously, they are in no conflict with what we are suggesting here. Finally, the report did give some estimates, and very rough estimates, I must admit, on the cost of the initial three years. We talked a little bit in terms of plans for implementation.

I would like to wind up by just commenting briefly on the two-day meeting which took place in April. The National Commission invited about 30 representatives from the library community and several of the Commissioners to Washington to a two-day conference to discuss the Westat study for the Commission. The meeting really had three goals: 1) provide access to study recommendations; 2) determine if the recommendations are feasible and desirable in terms of how they support the Commission's goals for a national network; and 3) recommend to the National Commission some next steps to be taken for possible implementation.

I would just like to review briefly some of the conclusions from this conference, and I preface this by making sure that you understand that these are really just a consensus of opinions of the participants; they do not represent decisions made by the Commission. The comments are divided according to categories of materials. During the two days we broke up into three different groups, one for monographs, one of serials and one for the nonbook materials, termed "nonbibliocentric materials" by the group. What I am going to review are categorized by these three basic types of materials.

Basically, in the nonbibliocentric materials category, they felt that we really did not have enough data or enough understanding to know how to prepare a national plan to handle these kinds of materials. The group felt that priority studies need to be undertaken to collect and assemble sufficient qualitative as well as quantitative information and define the field. The group suggested that experts in the area assist the Commission in trying to better design this area. (And really we felt that the report should indicate that nonbibliocentric materials are part of the Commission's total approach to sharing of resources, and that this should be clear in the program document. Now I am not talking about the Westat study).

Secondly, there was a lot of discussion in all these groups about serials, as you can imagine. After the first day it was not clear there was much consensus at all, but by the second day, I felt that it really turned out quite well. Regarding serials, the feeling was that for planning purposes it may well be wise to have serials in the discrete resource category. A relatively small portion of currently published serials meet the bulk of the need generated by most user groups. A national resource center, either for all serials or for less extensively used serials, should have provision for access to these publications. I think the principle was essentially that of tying

together the ARL study on periodicals and including it as part of the recommendation we made in the Commission study. Even with such a periodical center and other accessible serial collections, access to distinct subject collections, including serials, would require initiative and support from individual libraries. Plans for serials control and access necessarily must take into account issues of copyright and other related consideration. Serials are perhaps the most urgent element in the bibliographic control problem. They should have special attention in national planning.

Regarding monographic material I have just a few comments. A national library network for monographic resource and service programs, perhaps separated from the serials, but not necessarily so, is endorsed. It should be built on existing resources with units at local, state, regional, and national levels. States should be required to show evidence of sufficient resources and support before participating in the national network.

Regional and national resources should be federally funded. Designation of resource centers will involve consideration of adequacies of resources and support. Performance criteria should be established for each network level. The use of LC MARC standards should be required to facilitate record interchange and building of the national data base. It is desirable to go forward on the basis of existing apparatus and organization to the degree possible, rather than waiting for a full national bibliographic system.

While there is some question about the desirability of having two separate networks, here referring to one for serials and one for monographs, there are advantages to going forward in that direction, building on existing strengths in each area, with coordination and compatibility at the national level. From a practical point of view, building by segments seemed desirable. The coordinating agency at the national level would set the standards to be followed by monographic resource centers. That essentially summarizes the feeling of this group that was called together to review the Westat study for the Commission.

* * * *

MR. HAMLIN: As the last speaker I will be very brief and just expand a little bit on the informal report given yesterday. It is almost an anti-climax to speak after the basic element of the task force report has been approved. When asked to take this task force assignment, I was quite surprised. I had given up dreams of being the leader of a task force. Task force to me meant armor and heavy arms, self-propelled, speeding across the landscape like a General Patton figure, two guns in hand out there in the front. And I called Stephen McCarthy right away and wondered if we should report the next day. He said we could take it a little easier than that, that was not quite the idea. And after a night's sleep on it, it seemed almost obvious that the goal of the task force was simply to suggest that we follow the English example and come up with a recommendation for a reasonable facsimile of the NLL Boston Spa journal operation. At that time you know, it was just becoming more than a journal operation. It was including

the monographic literature, and now has the name of the British Library Lending Division. That was such a successful operation under the real genius of Donald Urquhardt that it was a real temptation for the three of us to take the bit in our teeth and make a recommendation, not just for a national periodical resources center, but a full-fledged lending operation for all types of material. But one of the wiser members of the task force pulled us up short and thought we ought to hold to our assigned task, and therefore, we did make the recommendation which you considered and approved yesterday.

In our draft which the Executive Board members revised, we had some brief mention of the facilities of the Center for Research Libraries, but we did not mention two other possible facilities which I think must be considered, at least. One is the Institute for Scientific Information, which you perhaps will remember as the publisher of Current Contents. ISI has a facility for supplying on demand journal articles anytime, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This is good, however, only for a relatively few thousand journals, and only for really current material; I am not aware that they had much of a backfile. And so, that does not do the job at all. A more productive resource, of course, is the U.S. Book Exchange. But there again, you can not count on getting what you want. It does have the backfile, and so on.

So the Center for Research Libraries with its limited program in existence today seems to be a natural instrument to be considered in setting up anything for this country. Well, as you know, the Center did take the bit in the teeth. The Center has approved a program which was announced in their newsletter which many of you got last week, for furnishing journal articles from about 1965 to date including the humanities and the medical sciences. The Center is going much more into this than previously.

In going into this field, I am sure there will be sensitivity about the photographic reproduction of material in copyright. That will disturb some people, and also the publishers will be concerned that subscriptions will be curtailed. I am sure you people know these are false worries, and that we are going to be fighting as hard as ever for our dollars for our books and journal budgets. There may be some movement of our funds, but I will not go into that. These are problems that we just considered.

* * * *

Discussion

MR. ATKINSON: I have a comment on the perspective from Mr. Palmour. I must apologize that I have not gone over the full text of the report, but the limited experience we have had with on-line systems seems to me to be in conflict with the proposals for a national network and system. I detect a fundamental misconception on how on-line files work. In fact, that is the same misconception that people have with a main entry in an on-line bibliographic file, being what it is. In a manual mode the main point of entry that the protocols talked about in networks are simply not valid when you are dealing with an on-line system. That is, when I look on an OCLC screen or one of

our own screens and conclude that Toffler's Future Shock is in the Chemistry Library or that it is in Dartmouth. it makes no difference to me, nor would I go through a network when the electronics provide me with the ability to go directly to the place where it is located. Now, if there is a choice of a number of libraries, and most likely there is, that choice may well be controlled through the electronics itself, that is, by figuring out that Dartmouth or the Chemistry Library had the last four requests through the system. This will happen, and you have automatically the ability to communicate this. But you cannot in the human terms we work in, set up the kind of bureaucratic systems that are seemingly proposed and still have a valid, quick, cheaper, interlibrary system which takes advantage of the very files that you are proposing to construct. And I think that is a very fundamental thing that just happens, whether we plan it or not. That is the way it works.

Secondly, I think you have a slight overemphasis on LC's contribution to the cataloging effort. Without meaning at all to degrade the efforts of LC, the amount of the total cataloging being placed into the national pool may well prove that the Library of Congress accounts for 25 percent or so of the contributed national cataloging effort.

MR. PALMOUR: Regarding the first comment on the on-line system, we wrestled with that at some length because that is true, if you have an on-line system, you have the capability of going directly to who has it. Yet I think that certainly in the initial phases, it is not going to be a completely automated on-line system. In terms of the total number of libraries, only very few will have terminals. And to maintain the state structure, it may turn out that the financing will drive some of this, that there is some need for that protocol, because I do not think that the resource centers or the network managers, whoever they are, would want every library going directly just because they have a terminal. But I agree with you wholeheartedly, it does present a problem.

MR. BOSS: I would like to underscore something to which Mr. Palmour made brief reference in his earlier discussion and alluded to again just now. I sensed in the meeting in Washington that there was a rather fundamental difference in point of view among state librarians, public librarians, and academic librarians with regard to this five-level hierarchical structure. The feeling on the part of the state librarians seems to be that this traditional hierarchy pattern, developing within the various states should be extended clear through to a national program. I have some concern that the five-level hierarchy would somehow hinder a prompt response, and there should be provision for an institution to enter at the level where they would most likely find their material, and that large research libraries would probably access at the highest level of the system. Those whose needs could possibly be supplied in the immediate locality would enter a substantially lower level. But there was never really much involvement in discussions regarding this because the differences in perspective were so dramatic, with a heavy emphasis on monographic access by the public and state librarians at the meeting, and the heavy emphasis on serials access by the academic librarians.

I think it is very important to underscore those differences in perspectives, because I think they may have well been stumbling blocks in the development of any kind of national system that will attempt to satisfy all these different types of needs.

MR. DE GENNARO: If there are no other comments let me just sum up by saying that this has been a consciousness-raising session this morning. The first part of the morning is to raise your consciousness about the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the second part is to emphasize the importance of the National Periodical Resources Center as a component of that national system, a component that, I think is important to research libraries. I want to thank you all very much for your attention and attendance, and I think I will conclude the meeting at this point. Thank you.

* * * *

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACCESS TO RESOURCES

Interlibrary loan continues to be an important concern, but the Commission agrees that a second area of improving access should be investigated, access to the resources within each institution.

A number of obstacles to easy access have been identified, among them:

(1) All material not cataloged
(2) Cataloging backlog
(3) Filing backlog
(4) Complexity of library (lack of assistance and graphics)
(5) Misleading location information
(6) Temporary removal of cards from card catalog
(7) Decentralization of collection
(8) Condition of stacks
(9) Slow reshelving
(10) Search service
(11) Staff attitude (maximizing success of patron)
(12) Nature of turnstiles and ID cards
(13) Bindery schedules

ARL should seek to investigate what member libraries have done about their obstacles by conducting a "Spec Survey." A number of the areas may already be sufficiently studied. Those that warrant further investigation could be assigned to individual member institutions to undertake or, where competence to undertake the studies is too limited, a contract could be negotiated with a research organization outside ARL.

The Office of Management Studies would appear to be the appropriate coordinating agency in either case.

The Office of Management Studies has approached a granting agency with a proposal for a Service Development Program. Funding prospects appear quite bleak for a $75,000-100,000 venture. The Commission on Access, on the other hand, has found that there is considerable enthusiasm among ARL Directors to undertake the study of one or more of these areas if other libraries are committed to address complementary areas.

The Commission will expand on this idea at its May meeting, tentatively set for 5-8 p.m. on Wednesday, May 7.

Hugh Atkinson
John Berthel
Richard Boss, Chairman

April 21, 1975

* * * *

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE ARL/ACRL COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY STANDARDS

Significance of University Libraries

The rapid growth of American university libraries since World War II is one of the most remarkable changes that has occurred in higher education during the present century. An explanation of the emphasis on strong libraries is contained in a report issued by the American Council on Education. In its An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education, the report states: "The library is the heart of the university; no other single nonhuman factor is as obviously related to the quality of graduate education. A few universities with poor library resources have achieved considerable strength in several departments, in some cases because the universities are located close to other great library collections such as the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library. But institutions that are strong in all areas invariably have major national research libraries."

The reasons for the explosion of academic library collections in all the American states and Canadian provinces are complex, including such important factors as the establishment of numerous new institutions, the transformation of former agricultural and engineering colleges to the status of general universities, the enrollment of millions of additional students in colleges and universities, emphasis on faculty research and scholarly productivity, changing methods of instruction, expansion of book budgets, extensive foreign acquisition programs, the steadily growing rate of publication of books and journals, and, perhaps not least, the prestige accruing to a university possessing an outstanding library.

Era of Library Cooperation

In recent years, university and other research libraries have sought for ways and means to hold in check the mounting flood of printed materials. National, regional, and local union catalogs have been created to locate books in other libraries, there are cooperative purchasing agreements, on-going plans for subject specialization among libraries, programs for the centralized housing of little-used books, projects for microfilming large masses of material for preservation and to reduce bulk for storage, and a widespread system of interlibrary loans has developed.

As a general principle, individual university libraries are no longer regarded as separate and independent entities, the development of each proceeding without consideration of its neighbors. Instead, libraries have come to view their holdings within a larger frame of reference, as elements of a national resource, the sharing of which can be of immense mutual benefit. Large cooperative enterprises during the past 30 years have demonstrated

several facts: university libraries are able and willing to support programs for the improvement of library resources, the concept of libraries combining for the acquisition of research materials is feasible and desirable, and the research resources of American university libraries are a matter of national concern.

In relation to interlibrary cooperation, it must be recognized that currently there are serious imbalances in borrowing and lending among university and research libraries. The load and corresponding expense borne by the largest libraries are disproportionate. The most equitable solution to the dilemma appears to be a system of state subsidies, such as prevails in Illinois and New York.

The foregoing facts are directly or indirectly relevant to the matter of standards for university libraries.

Standards

Interest in and the need for university library standards have long been evident. Equally apparent have been the obstacles in the way of developing a set of criteria acceptable to professional university librarians. Among the difficulties are the lack of agreement on the definition of a university, skepticism among librarians as to the desirability of setting up formal standards, and the question of whether standards should be primarily quantitative or qualitative.

A solution to the first dilemma--what is a university?--appears to have been provided by the recently published classification of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, based on several years' research. A total of 18 categories of institutions of higher education are defined in the Commission's classification. For the purposes of the ARL-ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards, it is proposed to restrict a code of standards to the first four categories, all doctoral-granting institutions, described as follows:

1. Doctoral-granting institutions with heavy emphasis on research. These are the 50 leading institutions in terms of federal financial support of academic science in at least two of the past three years, provided they awarded at least 50 Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if a medical school was on the campus) in the last year.

2. Doctoral-granting institutions with moderate emphasis on research. These institutions were on the list of 100 leading institutions in terms of federal financial support in at least two out of three of the above three years and awarded at least 50 Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if a medical school was on the same campus) in the last year.

3. Doctoral-granting institutions with moderate emphasis on doctoral programs. These institutions awarded 40 or more Ph.D.'s in the last year (plus M.D.'s if a medical school was on the same campus)

or received at least $4 million in total federal financial support in the last year.

4. Limited emphasis on doctoral programs. These institutions awarded at least 10 Ph.D.'s in the last year, with the exception of a few new doctoral-granting institutions which may be expected to increase the number of Ph.D.'s awarded within a few years.

A further limitation is proposed. A "university" for the purposes of the recommended standards will offer doctoral programs in not less than three of the four major areas adopted by the American Council on Education for classifying doctoral degrees: humanities, biological sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences. Further, in groups 1 and 2 above, doctoral programs will be offered in not less than 20 of the 30 areas, and in groups 3 and 4, not less than 15 areas as defined by the National Research Council:

Areas of Graduate Study[1]

Mathematics	History
Physics and Astronomy	English and American Language and Literature
Chemistry	Modern Foreign Language and Literature
Earth Sciences	Classical Language and Literature
Engineering	Philosophy
Agriculture and Forestry	Speech and Dramatic Arts
Health Sciences	Fine Arts and Music
Biochemistry, Biophysics, Physiology and Biostatistics	Business Administration
Anatomy, Cytology, Entomology, Genetics, Microbiology, Embryology	Home Economics
Botany, Zoology, General Biology	Journalism
Psychology	Law, Jurisprudence
Anthropology and Archeology	Library and Archival Science
Sociology	Architecture
Economics and Econometrics	Education
Political Science and International Relations	Other Professional Fields (Count as 1 field of study)

Another reason for the suggested cut-off point is that collegiate institutions below the above four categories are within the province of the ACRL's Ad Hoc Committee to Revise the 1959 Standards for College Libraries, now actively at work.

Concerning the second roadblock to the adoption of a statement of university library standards -- the resistance and even downright opposition to any formally stated criteria -- the following points seem relevant:

---

[1] Source: National Academy of Sciences. National Research Council. Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities, 1958-1966. Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1967, pp. 5-11.

(1) Standards exist for college, junior college, school, public, professional, and other types of libraries; why should university libraries be an exception? (2) Failure by university librarians to participate in the preparation and adoption of standards is resulting in the task being taken out of their hands by budgeting, appropriating, and governing bodies -- such as state boards of higher education, state departments of education, and regional accrediting associations -- which make their own standards, usually unsatisfactory in nature to librarians. (3) University librarians, especially in newly developing institutions, need basic criteria and guidelines to follow as goals, internally and externally, for planning growth, for dealing with university administrators, etc. (4) All standards should be stated as minimal to avoid the criticism that standards level down instead of upgrading.

The matter of choosing between quantitative and qualitative standards is complex. Ideally, perhaps, qualitative criteria are preferable. Measuring quality, however, is far more difficult than measuring quantity, involving, for example, detailed checking of standard bibliographies, judgments by subject experts, comparisons with similar collections elsewhere, analyzing in detail the content of collections, and, not infrequently, simply using subjective opinions. Often so-called qualitative standards turn out to be rhetorical exercises, largely meaningless in applications to practical situations. Furthermore, as Clapp and Jordan stated, "When standardizing authorities omit or refuse to set standards in quantitative terms, the budgeting and appropriating authorities, who cannot avoid quantitative bases for their decisions, are compelled to adopt measures which though perhaps having the virtue of simplicity, may be essentially irrelevant" -- another argument for librarians to develop relevant measures.

For the foregoing reasons, the standards for university libraries proposed for adoption by the ARL and the ACRL are stated concretely. To make the recommended criteria even more specific and down to earth, the proposed standards are based primarily upon the best current practices as reported by leading American university libraries in University Library Statistics (ARL, 1969), supplemented by such sources as Clapp-Jordan's "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections," Metcalf's Planning Academic and Research Library Buildings, the Washington State Model Budget Analysis System for Libraries, and the ARL's annual Academic Library Statistics.

An important factor, affecting both quality and quantity, is location, though its impact may be difficult to determine. A university placed in the center of major library resources may be able to rely extensively upon the holdings of other institutions, while a university remote from large libraries will have to depend mainly on its own resources. An example of the first situation is the ambitious cooperative program recently announced by Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and the New York Public Library. Examples of isolated institutions are numerous, e.g., University of Colorado, University of Illinois, and University of Texas. In any case, cooperation has limitations. Every great research library must maintain a large degree of independence. A university library that leans too heavily on its neighbors is unlikely to provide satisfactory service to its students and faculty.

The basic areas in which the Joint Committee is proposing adoption of standards are as follows: resources, personnel, space, finances, public service, and administration.

I. Resources. At least 10 criteria may be used in measuring a library's resources: (1) total volume holdings, (2) total volume holdings in relation to student enrollment, (3) volume holdings in relation to graduate student enrollment, (4) volume holdings in relation to number of faculty members, (5) volume holdings in relation to major subject fields for undergraduates, (6) volume holdings in relation to fields of concentration at the masters level, (7) volume holdings in relation to fields of graduate concentration at the doctoral level, (8) number of volumes added annually--average of last five years, (9) number of current periodical subscriptions, (10) number of current serial subscriptions. It would also be practicable to look at volumes added in relation to total holdings. For certain fields requiring currency of information, a volumes-added figure may be more significant than volumes held--a factor which tends to measure retrospective strength.

A majority of these criteria was adopted by Clapp-Jordan, and in somewhat modified form by Washington State's Model Budget Analysis System, in measuring library holdings. The general formula developed by Clapp-Jordan has been widely applied for nearly a decade and for the most part has demonstrated its validity as a practical device for testing the strength of a library's collections. With certain simplifications and modifications, as specified below, therefore, the basic formula is recommended as the ARL-ACRL standard:

1. Basic collection (undergraduate level)..... 85,000 volumes
   (Clapp-Jordan: 50,750 volumes)

2. Allowance per F.T.E. faculty member ..... 100 volumes

3. Allowance per F.T.E. student ..... 15 volumes
   (Clapp-Jordan: 12 volumes)

4. Allowance per field of undergraduate concentration ..... 350 volumes
   (Clapp-Jordan: 335 volumes)

5. Allowance per master's field, when no doctorate offered in field ..... 6,000 volumes
   (Clapp-Jordan: 3,050 volumes)

6. Allowance per master's field, when doctorate is offered in field ..... 3,000 volumes

7. Allowance per doctoral field[1] ..... 24,500 volumes

A standard for total holdings would also be reasonable. In the ARL's Academic Library Statistics for 1973-74 the median number of volumes held was 1,553,192 for the 82 ARL members. A median of 1,500,000 volumes is recommended for university libraries in groups one and two; 1,000,000 volumes in group three; and 750,000 in group four. If cataloged, or otherwise processed for use, government publications should be included in the volume count.

Rate of Increase

A deficiency in the Clapp-Jordan formula is the lack of provision for growth of the collection. It is a truism that constant growth is essential to keep a library alive. This factor is recognized in the Washington standard, with a provision stating that "A minimum number of acquisitions per year shall be established equal to five percent of the estimated number of units [volumes] of library resources held at the start of each fiscal

---

[1]For standardization purposes, the fields defined in the American Council on Education's statistical compilation of earned doctorates can serve. They are as follows:

Humanities	Biological Sciences	Physical Sciences	Social Sciences
Architecture	Agriculture	Astronomy	Anthropology
Classical Languages	Anatomy	Chemistry	Business and Commerce
English	Bacteriology	Engineering, Aeronautical	Economics
Fine Arts	Biochemistry	Engineering, Chemical	Education
French	Biology	Engineering, Civil	History
German	Botany	Engineering Electrical	International Relations
Journalism	Entomology	Engineering, Mechanical	Law
Music	Forestry	Engineering, Other	Library Science
Philosophy	Home Economics	Geography	Political Science
Religious Education and Bible	Nursing	Geology	Public Administration
Russian	Pharmacy	Mathematics	Social Work
Spanish	Physiology	Metallurgy	Sociology
Speech and Dramatic Arts	Psychology	Meteorology	Social Sciences Other
Theology	Public Health	Physics	
Foreign Languages, Other	Veterinary Medicine	Physical Sciences, Other	
	Zoology		
	Biological Sciences, Other		

year." The five percent figure is intended to serve as a "floor factor" and "would come into effect when 100 percent of formula was reached and the institution's growth in enrollment or programs would allow for an increase of less than the five percent."

The experience of our largest university libraries indicates that the five percent figure may be unrealistic when collections exceed a certain size. For example, in 1973-74, Harvard University Libraries, with 9,028,385 volumes, added 297,283 volumes (gross). The five percent formula would have called for the addition of 451,420 volumes. Similarly, Yale, with 6,350,824 volumes, should have added 317,541 volumes; actual additions were 190,750 volumes (gross). For the largest libraries, an alternative would be to adopt the Washington State formula on rate of growth and after 100 percent of the formula has been reached, continue to add five percent annually to the target size.

The net number of volumes added among the 82 libraries included in Academic Library Statistics ranged from 198,724 to 28,733, or gross figures from 297,283 to 32,132 volumes. The median for the 82 institutions was 78,671 volumes gross and 71,525 volumes net. It is proposed that the minimum standard be set at 100,000 volumes annually for the first two categories of the Carnegie Commission's classification, and 50,000 volumes for categories three and four.

An important factor that should not be overlooked is that the growth of collections should bear a close relationship to the development of academic programs. Some areas make greater demands than others, and new offerings will require an immediate library response.

Periodicals.

In actual application, the Clapp-Jordan formula for current periodicals has been found low, producing figures substantially under the holdings of strong libraries. A more realistic formula is proposed herewith for periodical titles:

1. Undergraduate collection 500
   (Clapp-Jordan: 250)

2. Per F.T.E. faculty number 2
   (Clapp-Jordan: 1)

3. Per field of undergraduate concentration 6
   (Clapp-Jordan: 3)

4. Per field of graduate concentration--master's 20
   (Clapp-Jordan: 10)

5. Per field of graduate concentration--doctoral 200
   (Clapp-Jordan: 100)

Among the university libraries included in Academic Library Statistics for 1973-74, the number of current periodicals received ranged from a low of 7,631 to a high of 100,000 -- the latter figure suspect because it probably did not differentiate between periodicals and serials. The median was 19,343. As a standard, 20,000 titles are recommended as a minimum total for institutions in categories one and two and 10,000 in groups three and four.

Also calling for standardization is usage of the terms "periodical" and "serial." In some university libraries, the two are not differentiated; instead, all are reported as "periodicals," producing grossly distorted figures. Serial publications in a university library collection may outnumber periodicals by more than two to one. An acceptable definition is offered by the U.S. Office of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics, as follows:

> A periodical is a publication that is issued in parts which usually contains articles by several contributors. It generally has a distinctive title and the successive numbers or parts are intended to appear at stated intervals and usually for an indefinite period. Serials include periodicals, newspapers, annual reports, yearbooks, memoirs, proceedings, transactions of societies, and may include monographic and publishers' series.

An alternative is the definition of periodicals used in LIBGIS' "Library General Information Survey," and adopted for the ARL's annual summary of Academic Library Statistics:

> A periodical is a publication constituting one issue in a continuous series under the same title published at regular or irregular intervals, over an indefinite period, individual issues in the series being numbered consecutively or each issue being dated. Newspapers as well as publications appearing annually or less frequently are included in the definition.

It should be noted that this definition does not differentiate between periodicals and serials, and for that reason the first definition is preferable.

Microforms

Several formulas for measuring the size of collections attempt to include microforms in the volume count. The problem is of great complexity because of the varied nature of microforms: microfilm rolls, microfiche, microcards, microprint, ultramicrofiche, etc. Clapp-Jordan propose that "fully-cataloged material in microform will be measured in volumes as though it were in original form." The Washington State formula states that "one reel of microfilm or eight micro-cards or microfiche" should be counted as a volume. The U.S. Office of Education's Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities uses another method of counting microforms: one reel of microfilm is equal to a unit [volume] of library resources; for all other microtext material,

five pieces equal one volume. Even more complicated is a plan proposed by the New York State Education Department's Advisory Committee on Planning for the Academic Libraries of New York. In the Committee's "Guidelines for Assessing the Adequacy of Academic Libraries of New York State" (1973), microforms are counted as volumes, using this formula for counting a unit or volume of library resources: one reel of microfilm, eight microcards, eight sheets of microfiche, four sheets of microprint, and one-seventh sheet of ultrafiche.

It is all too obvious that these various schemes add up to total confusion, leading libraries into a dense thicket from which there is no escape, resulting in astronomical figures which make comparisons between individual libraries impossible. Adoption of such plans is apparently a consequence of the pressure on newer libraries to acquire large numbers of "volumes" quickly.

The Annual Report of the Library of Congress has continued to separate various categories of material in its statistical analysis of holdings. Three types of microforms are recognized in the breakdown: micro-opaques, microfiche, and microfilm (reels and strips). This topic was debated at some length in the ARL meeting in Washington, D.C., on January 6, 1969. (See: ARL Minutes of the Seventy-third Meeting, p. 35, 53-56.) At the conclusion of the discussion, the ARL membership voted approval for continuing to count microforms as a separate category.

It is proposed, accordingly, that the 1969 action of the Association of Research Libraries be reaffirmed, and that the annual ARL Academic Library Statistics continue to include analyses of microform holdings under four categories: reels of microfilm, number of microcards, number of microprint sheets, and number of microfiches.

(A strong supporter of the idea of counting microforms as volumes proposed that only complete bibliographical units be included in such a count, e.g., whole volumes of periodicals and entire books, eliminating single periodical articles, chapters in books, and ephemeral pamphlets. In short, one should apply the same criteria for defining a volume as for material in traditional formats. The logic of such a scheme is obvious, but the administrative difficulties are too serious for the Committee to recommend it.)

II. Personnel. Personnel standards may involve such factors as (1) Ratio of professional to nonprofessional staff; (2) Size of staff in relation to student enrollment; (3) Size of technical staff in relation to acquisition rate or to growth of collections; (4) Length of work week and work year; (5) Status of professional librarians; and (6) the influence of centralization and decentralization on size of staff.

Professional-Nonprofessional Ratio

Research studies have demonstrated that two-thirds or more of the work in an academic library can be done successfully and economically by nonprofessional personnel, including student assistants. That appears to be the prevailing distribution among American university libraries at present,

though ratios as high as four or five clericals to one professional have been proposed. The compilation of Academic Library Statistics for 1972-73 for ARL members revealed that the percentage of professional librarians ranged from 21.9 to 48.6 with an average of 33.3 and a median of 32.6. As a university library standard it is recommended that the professional staff should not exceed one-third of the total staff. (In Canada, the current range is from 16.5 to 29.6, with an average of 21.4 per cent.)

A further refinement is proposed, that is, the creation of two groups of staff members aside from the professional librarians. In addition to the professional and clerical categories there should be a "professional specialist" staff, composed of systems analysts, planning officers, photoreproduction specialists, information scientists, business managers, and other specialized technical personnel, who do not require graduate library school education, but whose training has been at a high level in another area.

Following the recommendations of Asheim's manpower study for the American Library Association, which defines five levels of library personnel, it is suggested that the clerical staff be divided into two categories: (1) technical assistants, who perform "simple, routine tasks and special skills tasks" for which technical-assistant courses and post-secondary training in special skills may be required; and (2) library clerks who are assigned typing, filing, and operation of business machines, for which business school or commercial training will constitute proper preparation.

Staff in Relation to Enrollment

In the Washington State standards, elaborate formulas have been developed for determining the number of staff required for public services and for technical processes. The public service standard is derived from the number of FTE students at various levels: underclassmen, upperclassmen, masters candidates, doctoral candidates, and registered outside users. The size of the technical processes staff is obtained by this formula: "Add the number of units of library resources estimated to be added in the year to which the calculation applies, to the total units held at the beginning of that year plus the number of units estimated to be deleted." A rather complex mathematical formula is then applied to the "weighted units to be processed" to gain a total FTE technical processes staff. A similar scheme was devised by the University of California library system to establish staffing needs for public services and technical processes. Similar formulae are being developed for the SUNY libraries in New York and the Nebraska state colleges.

The University of California System approach to budgeting for library staff was selected by the Washington State libraries to serve as a basis for determining needs. According to this analysis, "In technical processes, the approach assumes that it becomes progressively more difficult to process materials as the size of the collection increases. It also assumes that this is partially offset by economies of scale which occur as the size increases. In public services, the assumption is made that demand on library resources increases as the level of the student's program increases."

According to University Library Statistics, among the 50 libraries surveyed, the ratio of professional staff members to enrollment varied from 1 to 41.64 to 1 to 675.72, with a median of 225.24. These figures included both public service and technical processes personnel. For total staff, professional and clerical, the median figure was 1 to 89. The median figures for professional staff exceeds the one-third maximum previously recommended.

Application of any ratio of library staff to student enrollment should be flexible for these reasons: Investigations indicate that the size of staff is directly affected by a large number of branches, i.e., by institutional policies relating to centralization or decentralization of library services; the library's rate of growth, which may require more or fewer staff members in technical services; and by the "climate" of a given institution, which may result in far heavier use of one library than another.

Concerning the staffing of technical services, libraries are obviously in a period of transition, and fixed formulas may be of doubtful validity from a long range point of view. The coming of MARC tape-produced cards from the Library of Congress, the computerized, on-line catalog maintained by the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC), and SOLINET, a similar program for the Southeast, are likely to affect drastically the staffing of technical departments in individual libraries in the near future.

Another possible answer to the question of staff size was offered the Committee by a prominent university librarian, who believes that the "only reasonably valid approach" is "to link professional staff size to the number of tenured faculty, because the latter number is perhaps the best indicator of the character of an institution, and it seems logical to link the 'academic' capacity of a library to the most important academic indicator in the institution." No suggestion was made, however, as to proper ratios or percentages, if this device were to be adopted.

Work Schedules.

A table in University Library Statistics, p. 72-74, shows that in the 50 institutions reporting, the weekly work schedule for the professional staff varied from 35 to 40 hours, with an average of 38.44. Whether this is a proper sphere for standardization may be debatable. Schedules may be necessary as a component of good management, but they should be matters for local decisions. Experiments in progress in a number of institutions provide flexible arrangements for professional staff members in harmony with improved status, a trend which should be encouraged. Rigid work schedules are incompatible with the librarian's research and scholarly activities. Administrators and staff members dedicated to individual research, association activities, writing, and special projects may carry work schedules considerably in excess of the norm.

Staff Perquisites.

A vacation allowance of one month or 31 days should be the minimum for all full-time professional staff members on 12-month appointments. Sab-

baticals for research projects, study leaves, hospital and health insurance, tenure, and retirement benefits should be identical to those for which the teaching faculty is eligible. Termination of contracts for professional staff members should be handled in accord with the AAUP's 1940 "Statement of Principles."

Status of Library Staff

After prolonged consideration, a Membership Meeting of the Association of College and Research Libraries adopted in 1971 a statement of "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians." [A copy of this document is included in the January 1975 Minutes.] Subsequently, a committee of the ACRL, the Association of American Colleges and the AAUP drafted a "Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians." The statement has been endorsed by the ACRL, AAUP, and 32 library organizations. The ARL Board voted to "endorse in principle faculty status for professional librarians, and commend to the attention of all college and university administrations the 'Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians.'" In the belief that general adoption of these concepts will upgrade the library profession, help avoid a drift toward unionization of library staffs, and minimize or reduce the troublesome divisiveness becoming prevalent in many institutions, the Joint Committee recommends endorsement of the principles of the ACRL statement as an important element in its general code of standards. Wherever possible library staff practices should relate to the university's general practices. Individual grievances, for example, should be handled through university grievance channels, after departmental grievance procedures have been exhausted. In the areas of appointment, tenure, promotion, and staff development, the librarians, organized as a faculty, can operate much the same as teaching faculty, though the criteria may vary. In other areas of library policy and practice, on the other hand, there may be many factors, inside and outside the library, that must be considered in decision making. The university librarian (director or dean) should have freedom to take action on the basis of advice from various sources: library faculty committees, department heads, teaching faculty, and other university personnel.

Each library or library system should develop a written personnel policy covering recruiting, employment practices, performance evaluation, grievance procedures, promotion and tenure, and staff development, in conformity with the foregoing principles.

III. Space. University Library Statistics reveals serious discrepancies between ideal or theoretical standards for space and hard existing facts. For example, among the 49 university libraries reporting, the seating capacity as a percentage of enrollment averaged only 16, in contrast to the usually recommended minimum of 25 or 30 percent. Nevertheless, the failure of many libraries to achieve adequate standards for various types of space is a sound reason for proposing adoption of satisfactory norms. On the basis of the findings of two leading experts in this field, Metcalf and Ellsworth, therefore the following basic criteria are proposed for the three chief elements: book, reader, and staff space:

Metcalf declares, in discussing space requirements for book stacks, that the first rule should be: "Beware of formulas." As a tentative suggestion, however, he states that "Not more than 12 volumes per square foot should be used for larger undergraduate collections of up to 100,000 volumes. Thirteen is safe for considerably larger collections and 15 for universities with great research collections and open access for graduate students and faculty only. Up to 20 can be used for a great research library with very limited stack access, narrow stack aisles and long ranges."

An alternative formula is recommended by Bareither and Schillinger: First 150,000 volumes: .1 SF per bound volume; second 150,000 volumes: .09 SF per bound volume; next 300,000 volumes: .08 SF per bound volume; all volumes in excess of 600,000 volumes: .07 SF per bound volume.[1]

Bareither and Schillinger note that "There are certain materials other than books stored in libraries that require stack space." A conversion basis is recommended for these materials, as follows:

Type of Material	Unit	Conversion Ratio Unit to Volume
Roughly Classified Pamphlets	Item*	15 to 1
Music Scores and Parts	Item	15 to 1
Sound Recordings	Record	6 to 1
Microfilm Reels	Reel	4 to 1
Maps	Map	9 to 1
Archival Materials	Cubic Feet	1 to 15

*A pamphlet, score, or one grouping in a manila folder equals one item. A grouping in a manila folder may consist of one paper or related papers.

For reader space, Metcalf concludes that "for undergraduates 25 sq. ft. for each seat in a reading area or for open carrels in a book stack should be adequate.... Thirty sq. ft. for the use of a master's candidate, 35 to 40 sq. ft. for one writing a doctoral dissertation, and from that up to as much as 75 sq. ft. or even more for a private study for a faculty member." Metcalf adds: "In general, it is fair to say that in our State universities, if provision can be made for 25 percent of the students at one time in the university library, that would be adequate.[2]

[1] Harlan D. Bareither and J.S. Schillinger, University Space Planning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968. p. 65.

[2] Keyes Metcalf and R.E. Ellsworth, Planning the Academic Library, p. 59.

Under the heading of "Space for the Staff," too many variables are present for any fixed criteria for administrative personnel. For the public-service staff, Metcalf recommends a minimum of 125 sq. ft. per person for circulation and reference department heads and "occasionally for some other professional assistants," and "100 sq. ft. per person on duty at one time." For all "groups that can be lumped under the heading 'processing,' 100 sq. ft. per person," Metcalf finds, "is an absolute minimum...for housing and equipment, plus another 25 sq. ft. for the section head of each section with as many as five persons."

The question of lighting has many complex aspects and it may be debatable whether it is practicable to state any standards. Metcalf "is not convinced that anything over 25 to 30 foot-candles is required except in limited areas," though he recommends that "a new library be wired so that 50 foot-candles of light intensity on reading surfaces can be made available anywhere without complete rewiring."

IV. Finances. Various attempts have been made to set up standards for the financial support of university libraries, e.g., relationship of total library expenditures to total university expenditures for general and educational purposes; relationship of total library expenditures to salaries and wages, to books, periodicals, and binding and to general expense; student per capita expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding for total library expenditures; financial support in relation to stages of library development; and the distribution of book funds by subject fields and by types of material.

The 1959 ALA Standards for College Libraries states that "The library budget should be determined in relation to the total budget of the institution for educational and general purposes." The program of library service outlined in the standards proposed "will normally require a minimum of 5 percent of the total educational and general budget." The 5 percent figure has been widely applied also to university libraries to measure adequacy of support.

In its Guide to University Library Standards (1965), the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries recommended that the following factors be taken into account in assessing the necessary standard to financial support: (a) size and quality of bookstock; (b) total student enrollment; (c) extent and growth of graduate studies; (d) rate of growth of the institution; (e) amount of faculty research; (f) extension projects; (g) introduction of new courses. In a complementary report CACUL recommended these levels of support: (1) "Ten percent of the institutional operating budget should be considered a minimum for the ordinary operation and development of established libraries, in universities with well established curricula, during the next 10 years." (2) "New institutions, and others which are undertaking new programmes, should raise their library expenditures to considerably more than 10 percent of the institutional operating budget until the necessary library services are established." Possible reasons for the relatively high percentage levels proposed by CACUL were that at the time the standard was set the Canadian libraries had more catching up to do in their development and a

number of new universities had been founded.[1]

It should be noted that some university presidents object to a percentage standard for library budgets on the ground that there is great diversity of "institutional environments" and of "missions" among individual institutions.

In realistic terms, one has to recognize that the university library's share of total funds is generally well under the old ACRL five percent figure and far below the Canadian utopia of ten percent. University Library Statistics revealed that among the 50 libraries reporting, the range was from 1.6 to 8.6 percent for total library expenditures in relation to total university expenditures for general and educational purposes. The average was 3.5 and the median 3.6 percent. The Joint Committee believes, nevertheless, that the five percent standard is still reasonable as a minimum for the maintenance of high-quality libraries.

On the matter of the relationship of total library expenditures to salaries and wages, to books, periodicals, and binding, and to general expense, reference again to University Library Statistics shows a wide spread. For salaries and wages, the range was from 43.6 to 67.8 percent (the median was 56); for books, periodicals, and binding, from 21.2 to 50 percent (median 36.5); and for general expense, from 2.5 to 28.5 percent (median 5.5). As a standard, it is proposed that the range for salaries and wages should be between 60 and 65 percent; for books, periodicals, and binding between 30 and 36 percent; and for general expense, between five and ten percent. It is recognized that the use of automation and other forms of mechanization may require a percentage increase in general expense.[2]

University Library Statistics reveals far greater differences among libraries in student per capita expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding, and for total library expenditures. Institution A, for example, spent more than ten times as much per capita in both categories as institution

---

[1] The 1973-74 expenditures of 23 Canadian university libraries ranged from a high of 11.78 to a low of 5.02 percent of institutional operating expenditures, with an average of 7.61 and a median of 7.49.

[2] The U.S. Office of Education's Library Statistics of College and Universities, 1971, covering more than 2,500 American college and university libraries, found that 57 percent of operating funds was spent on salaries and wages and 34 percent on books and other library materials. For comparative purposes, Canadian universities in 1973-74 spent an average of 57.1 percent on salaries, 30.7 on acquisitions and binding, and 12.2 for other expenses.

B at the bottom of the group. To be meaningful over a period of time, any standard would have to be expressed in an index or constant dollar figure. Without more extended investigation and research, the Joint Committee will defer any recommendation for standards in this area.

Concerning the distribution of book funds by subject fields and types of material, numerous studies exist. In their University Library Administration, Rogers and Weber conclude that "One type of book fund, the departmental allotment, is passing from the scene in most universities. Established at a time when funds were more scarce, such allotments insured a share of meager funds to each department. With greater affluence in book funds and with a more competent library curatorial staff, the raison d'etre for such funding and the very considerable red tape that accompanied it have vanished. Blanket order arrangements have contributed to the relinquishment of the allotment system also because many books are acquired across the whole range of disciplines." (p. 108)

A strong exception is made to this statement by another experienced university library administrator, who maintains that "we have excellent backing from our faculty because they have some say in how funds are spent." The happy affluence described by Rogers and Weber has also disappeared, at least temporarily, for many libraries.

Three steps are recommended for the management of available book funds: first, the development and adoption of an acquisition policy statement is recommended for every university library. By specifying the depth of coverage in all subject areas with which the library is concerned, the collections will be built up according to a logical, well-conceived plan, rather than aimlessly and without clear purpose. The extent of coverage will naturally vary widely in different institutions. Second, departmental allocations of reasonable size for current monographic material may be made to insure faculty participation in book selection. Third, emphasis should be placed on the role of librarians as book selectors; collection development should be a partnership between faculty and librarians, but the overall responsibility should rest with library selectors.

V. Public Services. Potential areas for standardization in the public service areas are somewhat limited. Circulation statistics, for example, are generally suspect, mainly because they may indicate a mere fraction of actual library use. Much consultation of open-shelf collections is unrecorded. A research study some years ago, sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, estimated that the nonrecorded use of books in libraries may be three to nine times as great as the formal circulation figures, varying according to policies governing stack access and open-shelf collections available to readers.

Readers' services assume a variety of forms: reference and research assistance, circulation of library materials, photographic services, interlibrary loans, teaching the use of books and libraries, exhibits, audio-visual services, etc. Few of these are susceptible to standardization. Most widely accepted is the interlibrary loan code first adopted in 1940 and since revised

from time to time to meet changing conditions.

A matter of frequent agitation among students is demands for longer hours. Nothing less than 24 hours per day will satisfy some nighthawks, but practical considerations of expense and staff must influence library administrators. Modern concepts of library architecture encourage self-service on the part of library users and minimum supervision. Well-planned, new buildings provide for a single public exit, equipped with turnstiles, through which everyone clears in leaving the library. The need for a full staff throughout the building is eliminated, especially when few readers are present. Reference and circulation services should be provided, however, during all hours in which the library is open, though reduced staff will be able to maintain these services during less active periods, such as late evening hours.

Among the 50 libraries reported in University Library Statistics, the schedule of hours open ranged from 74 to 121.5 per week, with a median of exactly 100. The median figure would appear to be a reasonable standard.

In the same tabulation, student per capita circulation, general and reserve, varied from 9.55 to 109.18, with a median of 39.41. General circulation alone ranges from 4.31 to 82.98, on an annual basis, with a median of 28.31. Despite skepticism about the validity of circulation statistics, they are somewhat indicative of the extent of library use. If that point is granted, a minimum general circulation (home use) of 30 borrowings per year and of 40 for general and reserve circulation are required to demonstrate that the library is a vital institution on campus. Circulation figures will be influenced, of course, by types of library buildings and length of loans.

The public service aspects of departmental and divisional libraries have long called for recognition and standardizing principles. On every university campus discussion goes on concerning the relative merits of centralized versus decentralized systems. Practices vary from completely centralized systems with all library operations in one building, to a central library supplemented by dozens or even scores of departmental libraries located elsewhere. Whatever policies are adopted in reference to centralization or decentralization of library services, the following rules are recommended:

1. Books and other library materials should be purchased or otherwise acquired through the library's acquisition department, and not by individual departments.

2. Materials should be classified, cataloged, bound, or otherwise processed centrally, except certain nonbook materials.

3. Books, pamphlets, periodicals, or other publications received and preserved should be recorded in the central library catalog. Exceptions may be made for certain non-

book materials, such as maps, prints, sound recordings, slides, sheet music, and picture collections. Deviations may also be reasonable for the processing of material in nonwestern and nonalphabetic languages, and because of local conditions, such as availability of space.

4. Every book acquired by the university or any of its departments should be considered a part of the library's collections. This principle applies also to the numerous "bootleg libraries" which have grown up on university campuses during the post World War II period, purchased from foundation and government grant funds to individuals and teaching departments.

5. Departmental or college libraries and librarians should belong to the central library organization, and be under the supervision of the chief librarian, who should be responsible for administration of the entire system.

6. There should be free interchange of material among all libraries on a campus.

7. In such matters as hours of service, physical facilities, and qualifications of staff, departmental and divisional library standards should be in general conformance with central library practices.

VI. Administration. Every university library should be governed by a statement of policies, including the following provisions:

1. A clear definition of the relation of the librarian to the university administration.

2. A definition of what constitutes the library resources of the university, specifying that they comprise all books, pamphlets, periodicals, and other materials purchased or acquired in any manner by the university and preserved and used in libraries to aid students and investigators.

3. Placing the administration of all library resources and services wherever located under the university librarian.

4. A description of the librarian's duties, making him/her responsible for the selection, acquisition, and preparation for use of all library materials; for the selection and direction of the library staff; for the preparation of budgets and reports; and for the performance of such other duties as are commonly included under university library administration.

5. Endorsement of the ALA "Bill of Rights" and "Right to Read" statements.

6. Appointment of a faculty-student library committee to advise the university librarian and library staff on programs of library development and services and to bring faculty-student points of view to the administration of the library. Such a committee should be appointed by the president with advice from the librarian or elected by the faculty senate or comparable body and report periodically to the president and the senate. Its personnel should represent a broad cross section of the faculty, the members should serve staggered terms with regular rotation, and it should function in an advisory and not administrative capacity.

Clifton Brock, Jr.
Gustave A. Harrer
John W. Heussman
Jay K. Lucker
John P. McDonald
Ellsworth G. Mason
Robert B. Downs, Chairman

March 1975

* * * *

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITIONS AND CATALOGING LIAISON COMMITTEE

To provide LC with some helpful data prior to its Congressional budget hearings this year, the NPAC Committee distributed a questionnaire to all ARL members designed to elicit information on the savings to research libraries in fiscal year 1974 as a consequence of NPAC and of LC cataloging generally. The questionnaire was imperfect in that it failed to take into account the effect of the current economic situation on library acquisition budgets as a consequence of which the number of titles cataloged with LC card copy by some of the responding libraries is only slightly larger now than before the NPAC program was begun. In a few instances it is smaller. The average increase in titles cataloged with LC copy (60 libraries responding) was 10,654. The difference in the cost of cataloging with LC copy compared with original cataloging varied greatly but averaged $7.19 per title. The use of LC cataloging copy generally in fiscal year 1974 saved 59 responding libraries $12,644,188 and the increased use of LC cataloging copy in that year compared with the use of LC copy in fiscal year '67 saved $4,943,325 for 51 responding libraries. Actually the savings resulting from increased use of LC cataloging probably was higher if a rough calculation is attempted based on our former experience that the use of LC copy by research libraries ranged between 40 and 60 percent of their cataloging prior to 1967/68 and the finding of the committee charged by the House Appropriations Subcommittee to investigate the NPAC that libraries were reporting use of LC cards for 75 percent of their cataloging. On this basis the saving to these 51 libraries alone through increased use of LC copy may well have been between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000.

Another more complicated questionnaire was completed by a small sample of ARL libraries, namely, the Boston Public Library and the libraries of Illinois, Michigan, Oregon, and Yale, based on an analysis of cataloging performed during the months of October, November and December, 1974 for publications received from countries not yet covered by NPAC and of publications from NPAC countries in categories excluded from cataloging by LC. In that three month period the five libraries in the sample cataloged, or held to await LC cataloging copy, 3,941 imprints from the countries not included in NPAC. Of these titles 1,910 were from South American countries. LC card copy was not available for 1,222 of the 1,910. Other countries for whose imprints LC cataloging coverage was poor or not prompt were Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Lebanon, the Philippine Republic, Poland, Syria, and Turkey. Of 186 imprints from the People's Republic of China, LC cards were available for 78. This last figure seems to reflect some improvement in coverage but obviously not as much as desired. The Library of Congress has plans for improved coverage of some of these countries in the near future as will be explained below.

Imprints from the NPAC countries in the 33 excluded categories totaled 495 in only 10 categories. Of these, 213 were dual imprints and multiple imprints and LC card copy was available for more than half. Poetry pamphlets, collected primarily by one of the five libraries in the sample, represented the second largest category with 106 imprints. Dissertations, primarily from the German Federal Republic, was third with 43. It would seem that the exclusions are well chosen if the sample is at all representative and that an effort by LC to acquire and catalog publications extensively in any of these categories would be of marginal value.

The Library of Congress is to be complimented on the extent and frequency of its reporting on the NPAC but there are several quite recent developments of interest. In keeping with its frequently stated objective of expanding its European coverage, LC has asked its appropriations subcommittees for approval of an extension of its European shared cataloging to include Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Poland, and Portugal and has requested funds for 11 additional positions for the NPAC program. The House report on the LC appropriation bill has not yet been received but it would seem overly sanguine to hope for any significant increases in funds for new positions this year.

As the data produced by our questionnarie seem to indicate, the area that most needs inclusion in the NPAC is South America. The Library of Congress agrees that the South American countries should have high priority. An accessions list for Brazil is now being produced and should appear soon. Rod Sarle, who had been brought back to Washington to work on a statement replying to the report on the NPAC of the House investigating committee, has been sent back to Rio. He returned via Columbia and Venezuela where he has made arrangements for procurement agents to work on increasing the flow of publications from those two countries. These individuals are expected to make a thorough sweep of exchange sources and to work with dealers in procuring new titles.

The effort to expand Chinese cataloging continues. Statistics reported by the 10 ARL libraries cooperating with LC in a special study indicate that LC is not getting or, at least, not cataloging, 25-30 percent of the titles these 10 libraries are receiving. Mr. Applebaum feels that this statistic is somewhat skewed by the fact that some of these titles are reprints of Chinese materials produced by the ARL Center for Chinese Research Materials which LC had cataloged locally long ago but for which cards had not been printed. To increase Chinese acquisitions, however, Frank McGowan is leaving to spend a month in Hong Kong and Singapore. He will be working with Hisao Matsumoto, LC's Tokyo field director, to improve the intake of Chinese publications. In addition to meeting with booksellers, Mr. McGowan will effect contractual arrangements with individuals, as is being done in Columbia and Venezuela, to work on improving the flow of Chinese materials.

Another study being conducted by LC with the cooperation of 12 ARL libraries is aimed at reducing the number of U.S. imprints for which LC cards are not available. The contribution of the ARL participants have

been very helpful in identifying new publishing houses not yet included in the Cataloging-in-Publication program as well as those publishers who have not been complying faithfully with their agreement to participate in the program.

Finally, the Committee wishes to offer its thanks to all the libraries who completed the two questionnaires, both of which required a great amount of record keeping and, in some cases, involved difficult cost calculations.

Philip J. McNiff
Howard Sullivan
Joseph H. Treyz
Frederick H. Wagman, Chairman

April 28, 1975

* * * *

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON A NATIONAL PERIODICAL RESOURCES PLAN

The Task Force on a National Periodical Resources Plan recommends that the following resolution be adopted by the Board of the Association of Research Libraries:

The Association of Research Libraries recommends the immediate establishment and continued support by the federal government of a national periodical resources library as a practical, effective and vitally needed aid to scholars and other research personnel in universities, business, industry and government. The proposed periodical library should provide, within relatively few days, journals published anywhere in the world which are needed for use in the advancement of knowledge or meeting the nation's pressing technical, economic and social problems.

No existing library, not even the Library of Congress, now acquires all the publications which are needed for the research and informational needs of the country. Even the combined library resources of a state or a multi-state region are insufficient to satisfy the informational resources of that area. For example, New York State has the largest collection of library resources of any state in the nation and a highly organized interlibrary loan system through which every library can exploit the collections in all of the others, yet it reports that readers and researchers are now requesting an average of 150 publications per day that cannot be found in any library in the state. Add to that figure many more unfilled and unfillable needs, unmeasured simply because the researcher's experience has taught him that there is so little prospect of finding the title that there is no point in making the request. The situation is even worse in other states and regions, with equally extensive needs for access to information but with fewer and smaller libraries.

A first and major step in remedying this situation is the provision of a central periodical library to which any library in this country can turn for loan of an issue or photocopy of an article with certain knowledge that the request will be filled within a few days. Various studies and experience with a similar service in Great Britain indicate clearly that a number of regional depositories are not essential, and that one national unit, virtually complete in research holdings and well staffed and organized for quick service, will meet the needs of this country.

Much data and research have demonstrated beyond question that a great many publications, though essential for the information they contain, are infrequently needed in any one library. This fact makes it practical for all libraries in the nation to share the use of one or a few copies of such

titles with very little likelihood of conflict because the same work is needed by two libraries at the same time. It means that a national collection of titles augmenting local library collections, if centrally located and organized for fast access by interlibrary loan, can enable every library to provide its readers quickly and easily with materials which are not available in the local collection. Since one such national collection is affordable and self-sufficiency for every library, state, or region, is not, the establishment of a national central journal library for this purpose is not merely the only possible solution, but a practical and effective one that is quickly achievable.

Eventually the United States must follow the example of Great Britain in establishing a central facility to service the libraries of the country not only with journals, but other types of publications. But journals are the one category most urgently needed by all libraries and their users; it is also a need that can be met with reasonable economy and speed.

It should be noted that a membership financed facility of this type already exists in the Center for Research Libraries. This gives service, within its limited means, to the member libraries which support it. It is currently receiving over 12,000 journals and has a collection of three million volumes which could be put to national service. Furthermore, it has an efficiently organized staff and operating procedures designed for effective loans to distant points. It has working agreements with certain resources outside this country to draw on their holdings. Its location in Chicago is reasonably central and most effective for all communication needs.

Therefore, the Association of Research Libraries also recommends that the planning of the proposed National Periodicals Resources Center include exploration of utilization of the Center for Research Libraries as the foundation for the new center.

Joseph E. Jeffs
Gordon Williams
Arthur T. Hamlin, Chairman

May 1975

* * * *

APPENDIX E

GETTING TO KNOW THE ARL
Report of the Discussion Session May 7, 1975

The May 7, 1975 evening program at the ARL membership meeting in Houston was intended to provide an opportunity for an informal exchange of information and ideas among ARL directors, elected officers and the Association staff. In addition to the officers and staff providing general information on the functions, organization, governance, services and resources of the Association, the members used the occasion to present their views and advice on the present and future activities of the ARL.

The meeting format consisted of simultaneous group discussions at six different tables; each group had a discussion leader and recorder. The groups were to rotate every half hour enabling ARL directors to participate in several of the group discussions.

Following is a list of the groups and some of the topics discussed:

TABLE 1:	Functions and Operations of the ARL Executive Office
Leader:	John McDonald
Recorder:	William Dix
Topics:	Liaison with associations, government organizations, higher education community and the profession.
	Federal legislative activities.
	Coordination of commissions, committees, and task forces.
	Administration of on-going projects.
TABLE 2:	The ARL Commissions
Leader:	Virginia Whitney
Recorder:	Edward Lathem
Topics:	Role of the Commissions.
	Composition, operating and reporting procedures.
	Current activities.
TABLE 3:	ARL Board and Association Governance
Leader:	Richard De Gennaro
Recorder:	Ralph Hopp
Topics:	Nature, composition, operation and reporting mechanisms.
	Opportunities for participation in the governance of the Association.
	Issues under consideration.
TABLE 4:	Committees and Task Forces of the Association
Leader:	Suzanne Frankie
Recorder:	William Budington
Topics:	Role of ARL Committees and Task Forces.
	Composition, operating and reporting procedures.
	Activities of current groups.

TABLE 5:	Office of University Library Management Studies
Leader:	Duane Webster
Recorder:	Stanley McElderry
Topics:	Current funding picture for OMS, Current programs and future plans, Administration, operation and reporting mechanisms.

TABLE 6:	Systems and Procedures Exchange Center and OMS Training Activities
Leader:	Jeffrey Gardner
Recorder:	Russell Shank
Topics:	SPEC services and resources. Plans for SPEC surveys. Training Film Program. Performance Review Training Project.

In general, membership reaction to the meeting was very favorable. Discussions regarding the functioning of the Association included ideas regarding mechanisms for better communication among directors and with the Board and Commissions, and the need for increased opportunities for greater membership participation in Association activities. Among the issues identified as warranting special attention were a need for better information on user needs, greater attention given to services, performance measures, and more reliable data on operations.

One specific suggestion has resulted in the appointment of a task force to review the roles of the Board and the Commissions. Policies and practices regarding appointments to committees and task forces will also be reviewed. Additional actions on other ideas are under consideration.

The response of the membership indicates an interest in having additional opportunities in the future for review and discussion of issues and activities of the Association.

Suzanne Frankie

June 20, 1975

* * * *

APPENDIX F

ATTENDANCE AT 86th MEETING

University of Alabama Libraries
James F. Wyatt

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald Koepp

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University
Donald K. Nelson

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

Brown University Library
Charles Churchwell

University of California Library
(Berkeley) Richard Dougherty

University of California Library
(Davis) Bernard Kreissman

University of California Library
(Los Angeles) Page Ackerman

University of California Library
(San Diego) John R. Haak

University of California Library
(Santa Barbara) Donald Davidson

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
James V. Jones

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Harold Schell

University of Colorado Library
Ellsworth Mason

Colorado State University Library
Le Moyne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

Cornell University Libraries
J. Gormly Miller

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

Duke University Libraries
Benjamin E. Powell

Emory University Library
Don L. Bosseau

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
Warren N. Boes

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

University of Houston Libraries
Stephen R. Salmon

Howard University Libraries
Kenneth S. Wilson

University of Illinois Library
Robert Oram

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iows State University Library
Warren Kuhn

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
John H. Berthel

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kentucky Libraries
Paul Willis

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

Library of Congress
John G. Lorenz

Linda Hall Library
Thomas D. Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
George Guidry

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

University of Maryland Library
Howard Rovelstad

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Gordon W. Fretwell

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libraries
Margaret A. Otto

University of Michigan Library
Robin N. Downes

Michigan State University Library
Richard Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Ralph H. Hopp

University of Missouri Library
Harry Butler

National Agricultural Library
Richard A. Farley

University of Nebraska Libraries
Gerald A. Rudolph

New York Public Library
James Henderson

New York State Library
Peter Paulson

New York University Libraries
Eugene Kennedy

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David E. Sparks

Ohio State University Libraries
Hugh Atkinson

University of Oklahoma Library
James K. Zink

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
H. William Axford

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Glenora Edward Rossell

Princeton University Library
William S. Dix

Rice University Library
Richard L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
Ben Bowman

Rutgers University Library
Virginia P. Whitney

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Russell Shank

University of Southern California Library
Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
Ralph E. McCoy

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at
Albany, C. James Schmidt

State University of New York at
Buffalo, Eldred Smith

State University of New York at
Stony Brook, John B. Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald Anthony

Temple University Library
Arthur Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
Richard Boss

University of Texas Libraries
Merle N. Boylan

Texas A&M University Library
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
David Esplin

Tulane University Library
John H. Gribbin

University of Utah Libraries
Roger Hanson

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz, Jr.

University of Washington Library
Marion A. Milczewski

Washington State University Library
G. Donald Smith

Washington University Libraries
William Kurth

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.

Yale University Libraries
Donald B. Engley

ARL Staff:

John P. McDonald ..... Executive Director
Suzanne Frankie ..... Assistant Executive Director
Duane E. Webster ..... Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
Jeffrey Gardner ..... Management Research Specialist

Guests

Edward Booher, McGraw Hill
Margaret Child, National Endowment for the Humanities
Robert Downs, University of Illinois
Herman H. Fussler, University of Chicago
Sam Hitt, President, Medical Library Association
Lawrence Livingston, Council on Library Resources
Robert Lumiansky, American Council of Learned Societies
Beverly Lynch, Association of College & Research Libraries
Fritz Machlup, New York University
Vernon Palmour, Public Research Institute
James E. Skipper, Research Libraries Group
Alphonse Trezza, National Commission on Libraries & Information Science
Edward Weiss, National Science Foundation - OSIS

Members Not Represented:

University of Alberta Library
University of Connecticut Library
University of Kansas Library
National Library of Canada
National Library of Medicine
Pennsylvania State University Library
Purdue University Library

APPENDIX G

OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCE OF THE ARL

ARL Officers and Board for 1975

Richard De Gennaro, President
Virginia P. Whitney, Vice President & President-elect
Ralph H. Hopp, Past President
Page Ackerman (Oct. 1977)
Richard Boss (Oct. 1977)
William S. Dix (Oct. 1976
Gustave Harrer (Oct. 1976)
Edward C. Lathem (Oct. 1977)
Stanley McElderry (Oct. 1975)
Russell Shank (Oct. 1977)

ARL COMMISSIONS*

1. Commission on Development of Resources

   Page Ackerman (Oct. 1977)
   Basil Stuart-Stubbs (Oct. 1975)
   Gustave Harrer, Chairman (Oct. 1976)

2. Commission on Organization of Resources

   Joseph Dagnese, (Oct. 1977)
   John McGowan, (Oct. 1976)
   Edward C. Lathem, Chairman (Oct. 1977)

3. Commission on Access to Resources

   Hugh Atkinson, (Oct. 1977)
   John Berthel, (Oct. 1976)
   Richard Boss, Chairman (Oct. 1976)

4. Commission on Management of Research Libraries

   Richard Dougherty, (Oct. 1977)
   Warren Haas (Oct. 1975)
   Russell Shank, (Oct. 1977)
   Stanley McElderry, Chairman (Oct. 1977)

5. ARL Executive Committee

   Ralph H. Hopp, Past President
   John McDonald, Executive Director
   Virginia P. Whitney, Vice President & President-elect
   Richard De Gennaro, President, Chairman

*The Commission on External Affairs was temporarily suspended in February 1975.

ARL STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

William Bond
William Cagle
John Finzi
Herman Kahn
Ray Frantz, Jr., Chairman

Committee on Center for Chinese Research Materials

Edwin G. Beal, Jr.
Roy Hofheinz, Jr.
Ying-mao Kau
David T. Roy
Eugene Wu
Philip McNiff, Chairman

Committee on Copyright

Howard Rovelstad, Chairman

Committee on Federal Relations

Warren N. Boe
Richard Couper
Joseph Jeffs
Philip McNiff
Paul Willis
Eugene Kennedy, Chairman

Committee on Foreign Newspaper on Microfilm

Gustave Harrer
Bruce Peel
Gordon Williams
John Lorenz, Chairman

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

Richard Chapin
Ruth Kirk
John Humphry
Jay Lucker
David Weber, Chairman

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee

Philip McNiff
Howard Sullivan
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

Committee on Negro Academic Libraries

Arthur Hamlin
Warren Boes, Chairman

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice President, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials*

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace
Beverly Gray, Boston University
Conrad Reining, Georgetown University
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, Indiana University
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Paul Horecky, Library of Congress
Joseph A. Placek, University of Michigan
Marion Milczewski, University of Washington, Chairman

*To be reconstituted

Far East

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Richard De Gennaro, University of Pennsylvania
Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

Western Europe

Norman Dudley, University of California-Los Angeles
Ten-Tsai Feng, Boston Public Library
William H. Kurth, Washington University-St. Louis
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Future of the Card Catalog

Hugh Atkinson
Richard De Gennaro
William Welsh
Joseph Rosenthal, Chairman

Task Force on National Periodical Resources Plan

Joseph Jeffs
Gordon Williams
Arthur Hamlin, Chairman

Task Force on Criteria for Nonuniversity Membership in ARL

Ben Bowman
John Gribbin
Philip McNiff
William Budington, Chairman

Task Force on NEH Research Tools Program

Richard Dougherty
James Henderson
Hyman Kritzer
David Laird
David Sparks
Ellsworth Mason, Chairman

ARL-ACRL Task Force on University Library Standards

Clifton Brock
Gustave Harrer
Jay Lucker
Ellsworth Mason
John McDonald
Jasper G. Schad
Robert Downs, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ANSI Committee Z-39 .....Eugene Kennedy
CONSER Project .....John McGowan
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials .....William Budington
Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee .....Roger Hanson
Library Relations Committee of the National
Microfilm Association .....Ralph E. McCoy
United States Book Exchange .....John Berthel

APPENDIX H

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

May 1975

University of Alabama Libraries
P. O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E2
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 884-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Koepp, Librarian
(602) 965-3415

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University
324 Clark Library
Provo, Utah 84601
Donald K. Nelson, Director of Libraries
(801) 374-1211 Ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T IW5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Richard Dougherty, Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110 Ext. 2167

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Page Ackerman, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California Library
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
John R. Haak, Acting Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Donald Davidson, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Dean, Library Admin. &
Director of Librs. (513) 475-2533

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Ellsworth Mason, Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Warren J. Haas, Vice President & Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
Norman D. Stevens, Acting Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
J. Gormly Miller, Director
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian
(603) 646-2236

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Donald L. Bosseau, Director
(404) 377-2411 Ext. 7691

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D. C. 20057
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
Warren N. Boes, Director
(404) 524-2716

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Director
(617) 495-2404

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Stephen R. Salmon, Director
(713) 749-2340

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D. C. 50059
Kenneth S. Wilson, Acting Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61803
Robert Oram, Associate Librarian
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50010
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Library Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
230 Garland Hall
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
John H. Berthel, Librarian
(301) 366-3300 Ext. 437 or 562

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
John L. Glinka, Acting Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries (216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washingotn, D. C. 20540
John G. Lorenz, Acting Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-3969

McGill University Library
Montreal, P.Q., Canada H3C 3G1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
Howard Rovelstad, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libraries
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Natalie N. Nicholson, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Frederick H. Wagman, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard Chapin, Librarian
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Ralph H. Hopp, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Dwight Tuckwood, Director
(314) 882-2739

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-3779

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A ON4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 992-0401

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-3231

New York State Library
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
John A. Humphry, Asst. Commissioner for Libraries (518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Eugene Kennedy, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-2140

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Nothwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illionis 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Hugh Atkinson, Director
(614) 422-6152

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
James K. Zink, Director
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
H. William Axford, University Librarian
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
William S. Dix, Librarian
(609) 452-3190

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Jospeh M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 749-2571

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main
Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian
(713) 528-4141 Ext. 312

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Ben Bowman, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Virginia P. Whitney, Librarian
(201) 932-7505

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at Tenth St., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20560
Russell Shank, Director
(202) 381-5496

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 746-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Ralph E. McCoy, Director
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
C. James Schmidt, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Eldred Smith, Director
(716) 831-4205

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11790
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Library
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Richard Boss, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(512) 471-3561

Texas A & M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
David Esplin, Acting Director
(416) 928-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
John H. Gribbin, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
G. Donald Smith, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
William Kurth, Librarian
(314) 863-0100 Ext. 4523

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually. Subscription rates for U.S.A. and possessions are $10.00 a year; $5.00 an issue (foreign: $11.20 a year; $6.20 an issue). Checks should be made payable to the Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

Association of Research Libraries.
Minutes of the meeting. 1st–
Dec. 1932–
[Princeton, N. J., etc.]

v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th–10th, 12th called respectively: 10th–11th, 13th.
Issues:
Subject index.

1st–42d, Dec. 1932–Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 **59-30046**

Library of Congress

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.